

IQTIṢĀDUNĀ

OUR ECONOMICS



IQTISĀDUNĀ

Our Economics

AN OBJECTIVE STUDY CONSISTING OF
THE EXAMINATION AND CRITICISM OF
THE ECONOMIC DOCTRINES OF MARXISM,
CAPITALISM AND ISLAM AS CONCERNS
THE FUNDAMENTALS AND DETAILS OF
THEIR IDEAS

Muḥammad Bāqir aṣ-Ṣadr

Volume One — Part One

WOFIS
WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES
TEHRAN - IRAN

English translation
First edition 1982/1402
Second edition 1994/1414

Translated from the Arabic

Published by
World Organization for Islamic Services,
P. O. Box No.11165—1545,
Tehran — IRAN.

***In the Name of Allāh,
The All-compassionate, The All-merciful***

*Praise belongs to Allāh, the Lord of all being;
the All-compassionate, the All-merciful;
the Master of the Day of Judgement;
Thee only we serve, and to Thee alone we pray
for succour;
Guide us in the straight path;
the path of those whom Thou host blessed,
not of those against whom Thou art wrathful,
nor of those who are astray.*

** * * * **

*O' Allāh! send your blessings to the head of
your messengers and the last of
your prophets,
Muḥammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.
Also send your blessings to all your
prophets and envoys.*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
أَحْمَدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
مَلِكِ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ
اهْدِنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ صِرَاطَ الَّذِينَ
أَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ غَيْرِ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ
وَلَا الضَّالِّينَ

اللَّهُمَّ صَلِّ عَلَى
سَيِّدِ رُسُلِكَ وَخَاتَمِ أَنْبِيَائِكَ
مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ الطَّيِّبِينَ الطَّاهِرِينَ
وَصَلِّ عَلَى جَمِيعِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالْمُرْسَلِينَ

C O N T E N T S

	Page
TRANSLITERATION	xii
PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD :	
In Arabic	xiii
English translation	xv
AUTHOR'S PREFACE	xvii
AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION	xxxix

CHAPTER ONE

MARXISM

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM:

I — INTRODUCTION	3
SINGLE FACTOR THEORIES	5
THE ECONOMIC FACTOR OR HISTORICAL	
MARERIALISM	7
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AND THE	
CHARACTERISTIC OF FACTUALITY	13
II — THE THEORY IN THE LIGHT OF PHILOSOPHICAL	
BASIS	18
IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF DIALECTIC	21
A — Dialectical Method:	22
B — Spuriousness of Historical Dialectic	25
C — Result Contradicts the Method:	27
IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM	29

III – WHAT IS THE THEORY IN GENERAL	34
FIRST: WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT	
ACCORDING TO THE HISTORICAL MATERIALISM? ..35	
A — The Philosophical Argument:	35
B — The Psychological Argument :	43
C — The Scientific Argument :	51
SECOND: DOES THERE EXIST A HIGHER	
CRITERION?	61
THIRD: WAS MARXISM ABLE TO COMPREHEND	
HISTORY IN ITS ENTIRETY?	69
1 – THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE	
FORCES	
AND MARXISM	74
2 – IDEOLOGY AND MARXISM	78
A — Religion: Religion	80
B — Philosophy:	86
C — (Scientific) Knowledge:	103
3 – CLASS-CONCEPTION OF MARXISM	110
4 – PHYSICAL FACTORS AND MARXISM	117
5 – AESTHETIC TASTE AND MARXISM	121
IV – THE THEORY WITH ITS DETAILS	125
WAS THERE A COMMUNIST SOCIETY?	125
HOW WE INTERPRET PRIMITIVE COMMUNISM .	127
WHAT IS THE ANTITHESIS OF (THE PRIMITIVE)	
COMMUNIST SOCIETY ?	130
THE SLAVERY SOCIETY	133
THE FEUDAL SOCIETY	136

A — The Transformation was not Revolutionary: ..	137
B — Social Transformation did not Proceed any Renewal of the Forces of Production	139
C — The Economic Situation had not Reached Perfection :	141
LASTLY THE CAPITALIST SOCIETY WAS	
FOUNDED	143
Marx Confession:	151
LAWS OF THE CAPITALIST SOCIETY	156
LABOUR IS THE BASIS OF VALUE	157
HOW DID MARX LAY DOWN THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF HIS ECONOMY?	160
CRITICISM OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF MARXIST ECONOMY	164
MARXIST CRITICISM OF CAPITALIST SOCIETY	179
INCONSISTENCIES OF CAPITALISM	181

CHAPTER TWO

MARXISM

MARXIST CREED :

I - INTRODUCTION	201
WHAT IS SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM?	203
GENERAL CRITICISM OF THE DOCTRINE	205
II - SOCIALISM	208
III - COMMUNISM	224

TRANSLITERATION

ARABIC LETTERS

Symbol	Transliteration	Symbol	Transliteration
--------	-----------------	--------	-----------------

ء	'	ك	k
ب	b	ل	l
ت	t	م	m
ث	th	ن	n
ج	j	ه	h
ح	ḥ	و	w
خ	kh	ي	y
د	d	ة	ah; at (c
ذ	dh		s
ر	r	ال	article al
ز	z		(even bef
س	s		antepala
ش	sh	Long Vowels	
ص	ṣ	آ	ā
ض	ḍ	و	ū
ط	ṭ	ي	ī
ظ	ẓ	Short Vowels	
ع	'	ا	a
غ	gh	و	u
ف	f	ي	i
ق	q		

تصدير

١- العلامة الكبير الحجة، والفقيه المجدد، والمفكر الاسلامي العبقري السيد محمد باقر الصدر (١٣٥٣/ ١٩٣٥ - ١٤٠٠/ ١٩٨٠) تغمده الله برحمته، بآثاره التي خلفها للمسلمين عامتهم ومفكريهم، وبحياته الحافلة بجهوده وجهاده التي قصرتها الأيدي الأثيمة - بكل أسف - لأشهر وأعرف، وأوسع جانبا، وأعمق دراسة، من أن نؤرخه في كلمة قصيرة مقتضبة نقدم بها الترجمة الانجليزية لأثره الشهير (اقتصادنا).

٢- سبق وأن عرّفنا قراءنا الكرام بأهم آثار السيد الصدر في فاتحة الترجمة الانجليزية لكتاب (المرسل. الرسول. الرسالة) واليوم اذ ننشر - بعون الله وتسديده - الترجمة الانجليزية (لاقتصادنا) نجد أنفسنا مضطرين إلى أن نلفت انتباه قرائنا الكرام الى ما جاء في مقدّمة (اقتصادنا) نفسه، حيث عرض السيد الصدر في نهايتها نقاطا ستأ رأى من الضروري أن نلاحظ، وأن نلاحظ بعناية تامّة.

ولا نريد على ما قاله المؤلف نفسه رضي الله عنه، شيئا سوى أنّ هذه النقاط الست التي وضعها المؤلف أمام عينه حينما ألف الكتاب والتي أكّد على قرائه أن يضعوها أمام أعينهم حينما يقرأون الكتاب ويدرسون بحوثه كانت نفس هذه النقاط

تصدير

ماثلة أمام أعيننا حينما أقدمنا على نشر الترجمة الانجليزية للكتاب، ونؤكد على الاهتمام والعناية بها بمثل ما أكد به المؤلف، رحمه الله.

٣- انّ الترجمة الانجليزية لكتاب (اقتصادنا) قامت بها مؤسسة (پير محمد- ابراهيم) الباكستانية، باقتراح منّا، وبعد أن تمت الترجمة أحالتها إلينا، ولم يكن عندنا، بادئ الأمر من بواعث الثقة والاطمئنان الى صحة الترجمة وسلامة التّقل ما يدعونا الى أن نسارع الى نشرها، فبقيت نسخة الترجمة عندنا الى أن عثرنا على من عهدنا اليه مراجعتها وتلافي ما يراه من نقص فيها، وبعد ذلك عثرنا على نقائص، ولم يكن ذلك عن طريق المراجعة المستوعبة، وكان من حسن الحظّ أن وجدنا من يفقه اللّغتين العربيّة والانجليزية، وله اختصاص بالدراسات الاقتصادية فقرأ الترجمة الانجليزية وقارنها بالنّص العربيّ، وتلافي ما أمكنه تلافيه من نقائص وأخطاء كلّ ذلك حسب اجتهاده ورأيه.

وهنا وجدنا أنفسنا قد وصلنا إلى مرحلة كانت نهاية الشوط لما نملكه من امكانيات وما نقدر عليه من جهد وسعي، وبذلك يصح منا أن نسعى، بعون الله، إلى نشر الترجمة ولا يصحّ أن يوصف عملنا بأنّه مجازفة كان التّربّث خيرا منه. ومع كلّ هذا فإنّنا نفتح صدورنا لأيّ نقد وملاحظة يردنا، ونرحب بأيّ اقتراح يعود الى تحسين عملنا، ونأمل أن نتلافى ما نجده من نواقص وأخطاء فيما نستقبله، بتوفيق الله سبحانه.

ونرجو الله سبحانه أن يجعل في الترجمة الانجليزية لهذا الكتاب كلّ خير وبركة، وأن يعمّ به النّفع، كما صنع بأصله العربيّ وأن يجعل عملنا خالصا لوجهه الكريم، أنّه نعم المولى ونعم النصير.

١٤٠١/١١/٢٧

المؤسسة العالمية للخدمات الاسلاميّة

١٩٨١/٩/٢٦

(لجنة التّأليف والترجمة والنّشر)

طهران — ايران

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

1. The great Islamic scholar, regenerating jurist and thinker of genius, al-‘Allāmah as-Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir aṣ-Ṣadr (1353/ 1935 — 1400/1980) may Allāh encompass him with His Mercy, because of the works which he bequeathed to the Muslims, both the ordinary and the educated among them, and because of his life, which was filled with effort and striving, and which was cut short at the hands of criminals, he is too famous and well-known for us to give his biography in this brief preface which we are giving to the English translation of his celebrated book, *Iqtisadunā*, the Islamic System of Economics.

2. In the preface to the English translation of *The Revealer*, *The Messenger*, *The Message* we have introduced the works of as-Sayyid aṣ-Ṣadr to our respected readers. And now that we are publishing the English translation of *Iqtiṣādunā* we find ourselves compelled to turn the attention of our readers to the preface of *Iqtiṣādunā* itself, where as-Sayyid aṣ-Ṣadr has mentioned six points which he deemed necessary for the readers to observe, and that also carefully.

We do not wish to say anything more than what the author has mentioned himself, except that these six points, which he introduced while writing the book and emphasized to his readers to keep in their mind while reading the book and studying its

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

discussions, the same six points were in our mind also when we decided to publish its English translation. And we emphasize, alongwith the author, the careful observation of these points.

3. The English translation of *Iqtiṣādunā* was prepared by the Peermahomed Ebrāhim Trust of Pakistan at our instigation. After completing the translation it was submitted to us, but at that time we did not have the means to be sure and satisfied about its authenticity. So it remained with us until we found the person who could check and make up the defects in the translation. Then again just by the way we were confronted with some defects, and fortunately we found a person who was familiar with both the Arabic and English languages with qualifications in economical studies. He compared the translation with Arabic version and corrected, according to his own views, as much as he could.

At this point we reached the utmost stage of our abilities and facilities for correction of the translation, and so we deemed it right to publish it, by the help of Allāh; and thus it cannot be said that our efforts were reckless and it would have been better to delay the publication. After all these efforts we shall gladly accept any criticism or observation, and welcome any suggestion to improve our work. We hope to correct the defects and mistakes with which we may be confronted in future.

We ask Allāh, the Glorified, to bless the English translation of this book and to generalize its benefit as He did for the original Arabic version. And may He accept our work sincerely for His Holy Self. He is the best Master and the best Helper.

WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES
(Board of Writing, Translation and Publication)

27/11/1401

26/9/1981

Tehran — Iran.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

In the name of Allāh, the Merciful, the Compassionate

It pleases me to present the second edition of the book *Iqtiṣādunā* (Our Economics). I believe more and more firmly and have become more and more convinced that the *ummah* (the Muslim Community) has begun to understand its true message which is Islam and, despite of all kinds of colonial deception, realizes that Islam is the only way to salvation and that the Islamic system is the natural framework within which it should determine its life and expend its efforts and on the basis of which it should build its existence.

I would have liked to have had the opportunity to expand on some topics of the book and to focus more on a number of the points" which it made. However, since I do not have enough space now to talk about the points discussed in the book, I will not leave this matter without saying a word on the subject of the book itself and the relationship of this important subject with the

life and problems of the *ummah* and its gradually in-creasing significance not only on the Islamic level but also on the human level.

On the Islamic level the *ummah* lives its complete *jihad* (holy war in Islam) against its backwardness and its downfall. It is attempting to move, both politically and socially, towards a better existence, a firmer structure and a more prosperous and flourishing economy. After a string of both failed and successful attempts, the *ummah* will find that there is only one path along which to proceed and that is the path of Islam and will find that there is no other framework within which to find solutions to the problems of economic backwardness except the framework of the Islamic economic system.

Humanity on the human level is the enduring of the most severe kinds of worry and the fluctuation between the two world trends, mined with atom bombs, rockets and the tools of destruction. Humanity will find no salvation for itself except at the only door of heaven which remains open and that is Islam.

In this introduction let us take the Islamic leve for discussion.

On the Islamic Level

When the. Islamic world began to get to know the European man and yield to his intellectual guidance and his leadership of the civilization procession, instead of believing in its real message and the guidelines on this message for the life of mankind, it began to comprehend its role in life within the framework of the familiar division' of the countries of the world undertaken by the Europeans. They had divided up the world into countries which were economically advanced and those which were economically poor or backward, on the basis of their economic level and productivity potential. The countries of the Islamic world were all in the latter category which, according to European logic, had to acknow-

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

ledge the leadership of the advanced countries and give them free scope to infuse their spirit in them and map out for them the road to advancement.

In this way, the Islamic world, as a group of economically poor countries, began its life with Western civilization and came to view its problem as the problem of economically lagging behind the advanced countries whose economic progress had given them the leadership of the world. Those advanced countries taught the Islamic world that the only way to overcome this problem and to catch up with the advanced countries was for it to adopt the life-style of the European man as a leading practice and to mark out the steps of this practice in order to build up a perfect and complete economy capable of raising the backward Islamic countries to the level of the modern European nations.

Subordination in the Islamic world to the practice of the European man, as the leader of modern civilization, has expressed itself in three successively occurring forms and these forms still exist today in different parts of the Islamic world.

The first is political subordination which found visual expression in the economically advanced European nations exercising of direct rule over the backward nations.

The second is economic subordination which went hand in hand with the rise of politically independent governments in the backward countries. This subordination found expression in the European economy being given full scope to play on the scene of these countries in different ways: to exploit their chief resources, to fill their vacuum with foreign capitalism and to monopolize a number of economic conveniences on the pretext of training the natives of the various countries to shoulder the burden of the economic development of their countries.

The third is subordination in method which was practiced by the people of the Islamic world in numerous experiments. Through these experiments, they tried to gain political independence

dence and get rid of the domination of the European economy. They began to think of reliance on their own power to develop their economy and overcome their backwardness. However, they were only able to understand the nature of the problem shown by their economic backwardness within the framework of the European understanding of it.

Therefore, they were forced to choose the same method the Europeans had adopted in building up their modern economy.

Great differences in points of view arose with regard to those experiments, while the method was being drawn up and applied. However, these differences were sometimes merely concerned with the choice of the general form the method should take from among the numerous forms the method had taken when the modern European man had applied it. The choice of method practiced by the modern European man was, in fact, a point of agreement because it was the tax of the intellectual belief of the Western civilization. It was the determining of one of its forms which led to disagreement.

The recent experiments in economic development in the Islamic world have usually been faced with two forms used in the economic development of the modern civilization. The two forms are the free economy based on capitalism and the planned economy based on socialism.

Both of these forms have been used a great deal to build up the modern European economy. The question which arose with regard to the study of the maximum level of application in the Islamic world was, "which is the most appropriate of the two forms and the one most capable of bringing success to the struggle of the *ummah* against its economic backwardness and the building up of an advanced economy of the level of the age?"

The oldest tendency in the Islamic world was to choose the first form in the development and building up of the internal economy of the various countries, i.e. the free economy based

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

on capitalism. This was because the capitalist axis of the European economy was the quickest of the two axes to penetrate the Islamic world and to polarize its countries as the centres of authority.

Through the political struggle of the *ummah* with colonialism and its attempts to free itself from the influence of the capitalist axis, some ruling experiments resulted in the discovery that the European antithesis to the capitalist axis was the socialist axis. Thus, there grew up a tendency to choose the second form for development, i.e. the planned economy based on socialism. This was as a result of the reconciliation between the belief in the European man as the leader of the backward countries and the reality of the struggle with the political existence of capitalism.

The subordination of the backward countries to the economically advanced countries still imposes upon them the belief in European practice as a leading principle. Moreover, the capitalist wing of this practice still clashes with the feelings for battle against the living colonial reality. Thus, the planned socialist economy was adopted as the other form of leading practice.

Each of the two trends has its own proofs with which it justifies its own point of view. The first trend usually uses the great advancement which the capitalist European states have attained and the levels in production and industrialization they have reached as a result of the adoption of the free economy as the method for development. In addition to this, it is possible for the backward countries, if they adopt the same course and undergo the same experience, to take a short cut and reach the desired level of economic development more quickly. This is because they will be able to benefit from the European man's experiences in capitalism and employ all the working skills which the Europeans have taken hundreds of years to acquire.

The second trend explains its choice of the planned economy based on socialism, instead of the free economy, by the

fact that, although the free economy was able to produce for the leading European states in the capitalist world great gains, constant progress in technology and production and steadily increasing growth in their wealth, it is not capable of playing a similar role for the backward countries today. This is because the backward countries are today facing a great economic challenge represented by the great degree of progress the states of the west have attained and are confronted with unlimited rival possibilities on the economic level. Whereas the advanced states were not really faced with this great challenge, nor confronted with these rival possibilities, when they embarked on economic development; they launched their attack against conditions of economic backwardness and adopted the free economy as a course and procedure. Thus, it is necessary for the backward countries today to mobilize all forces and capabilities, both quickly and systematically, for the job of economic development by means of the planned economy based on socialism.

In its interpretation of the failure in application it has suffered, each of the two trends uses as an excuse the artificial conditions which the colonialists create in the region in order to hinder development procedures there. On account of this neither allows itself, when it senses failure, to think of any alternative method to the two forms which modern European practice has adopted in the west and east. This is despite of the existence of a ready-made alternative which is still very much alive, both theoretically and ideologically, in the life of the *ummah*, even if it is not being given the opportunity to be applied. And that is the Islamic method and economic system in Islam.

Here, I do not want to make a comparison between the Islamic economy and the capitalist and socialist economies from the economic and religious points of view because I am leaving this for the book itself. In fact, the book, *Iqtisādunā* makes a comparative in this respect. However, I would like to make a

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

comparison between the European economy, both its capitalist and socialist wings, and the Islamic economy with regard to the capacity of each to participate in the battle of the Islamic world against economic backwardness and the degree of ability of each of these methods to be the framework for the job of economic development.

When we leave the sphere of comparison between these economic methods, with regard to their intellectual and religious contents, for a comparison between them in respect of their practical ability to offer a framework for economic development, we must not merely base our comparison on the theoretical advantages of each. Rather, we must observe closely the circumstances of the *ummah* with regard to this subject, along with its spiritual and historical structure. This is because the *ummah* is where these methods will be applied. Thus, it is necessary for the assumed field of application, its particularities and its conditions to be carefully studied so that whatever is valuable in each method by way of effectiveness in application can be observed. Just as the effectiveness of the capitalistic free economy or the socialistic planned economy in the practice of the European man does not necessarily mean that this effectiveness is due to the economic method alone, such that it increases when the same method is adopted. Rather, the effectiveness is due to the method, as a part of each inextricably intertwined and part of the course of History. Thus, if the method is detached from its framework and its history, it will neither have such effectiveness nor yield such fruits.

Through a comparative study of the numerous economic schools and the possibilities of their practical success in the Islamic world, a basic fact should be presented with which the estimation of the situation is to a great extent connected. That is, that the need of economic development for an economic method is nothing but a need for a framework of social organization for states to adopt, so that it is possible for economic

development to be planned within this framework or the other merely by the state adopting it and adhering to it.

It is not possible for economic development and the battle against backwardness to play its due part except by acquiring a framework within which the *ummah* can be incorporated and by establishing a principle which is in harmony with it.

The movement of the entire *ummah* is a basic condition for the success of any development and any universal battle against backwardness. This is because the movement of the *ummah* is an expression of its growth, the growth of its will and the release of its inner talents and wherever the *ummah* fails to grow, the job of development cannot be carried out. Thus, the increase in foreign wealth and internal growth must proceed along the same course.

The very experience of the modern European man is a clear historical expression of this fact. The only reasons that the methods used in the European economy as frameworks for the job of development recorded in modern European history their dazzling success on the material level was the interaction of the nations with these methods, their movements in all fields of life in accordance with the direction and the demands of these methods and their great mental readiness over the years for this assimilation and interaction.

Thus, when we want to choose a method or a general framework for economic development inside the Islamic world, we must take this reality as a base and in the light of it search for a cultural system capable of raising the *ummah* and mobilizing its forces and its faculties for the battle against backwardness. Then, we must enter into this account the feelings, attitude, history and different complexities of the *ummah*.

Many of the economists make a mistake when they study the economy of the backward countries and apply to them the European methods of development without taking into account

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

the degree to which it is possible for the peoples of those countries to combine with these methods and the extent to which these methods are capable of being closely united with the *ummah*. There is for example the special psychological feeling of the *ummah* in the Islamic world towards colonialism. This feeling is marked by doubt, suspicion and fear as a result of a long bitter history of exploitation and struggle. Moreover, this feeling has created in the *ummah* a kind of recoiling from the European man's organizational gifts and a certain amount of apprehension in face of and a strong feeling against the organizations derived from the social practices in the countries of the colonialists. Even though these organizations may be good and free from colonialism from the political point of view, this feeling makes them incapable of creating an outlet for the forces of the *ummah* and leading it in the battle for construction. Therefore, by virtue of its psychological circumstances which the age of colonialism created and its recoiling from whatever is connected with it, the *ummah* must base its modern revival on a social organization and cultural particularities which are not related in origin to the countries of the colonialists.

It is this clear reality which has made a number of political gatherings in the Islamic world think of adopting nationalism as a philosophy, a cultural basis and a basis for a social structure in their endeavour to present slogans completely separate from the colonialist way of thinking. However, nationalism is merely a historical and linguistic bond; it is not in itself a philosophy with an ideology, nor a doctrine with fundamentals. Rather, it is by nature neutral in face of the absence of philosophies and social, ideological and religious doctrines. Therefore, it is in need of adopting a specific point of view with regard to existence and life and a particular philosophy on the basis of which the characteristics of its culture, revival and social structure can be fashioned.

It seems that many of the nationalist movements have also had that feeling and have realized that nationalism as raw material is in need of adopting a social philosophy and a specific social system. Thus, it has tried to reconcile that with the originality of the slogan which it enhances and its dissociation from the European man. Therefore, nationalism has proclaimed Arab socialism because it has realized that nationalism alone is not sufficient. It was in need of a system and proclaimed socialism within an Arab framework, in order to get rid of the strong reaction of the *ummah* to any slogan or philosophy connected with the colonial world. Therefore, nationalism, by ascribing socialism to Arabism, tried to conceal the foreign reality represented in socialism from the historical and intellectual points of view. It is a futile cover, though, which cannot succeed in fooling the *ummah*. This is because this shaky framework is nothing but an apparent and vague framework of the foreign content, represented by socialism. Or else, any role this framework plays in the socialist field of organization and any development of the Arab factor in this matter do not mean that "Arabic" as a language and "Arab" as history, blood and race further a specific philosophy for the social structure. Rather, everything that falls into the field of application is due to the "Arab" factor. In the field of application this factor came to mean the exclusion of that in socialism which was incompatible with the prevailing traditions in Arab society which possible circumstances had not yet come to change, such as spiritual tendencies, including belief in God. Thus, the Arab framework does not give socialism a new spirit which differs from its existing intellectual and ideological situation in the colonial countries. Rather, by this is meant the expression of specific exceptions which may be temporary but the exception does not alter the essence of the matter, nor the true content of the slogan. Moreover, the propagandists of Arab socialism cannot possibly make basic distinctions between Arab, Persian or Turkish socialism,

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

nor can they explain how socialism differs by merely being given this or that nationalistic framework. This is because, in reality, the content and essence do not differ. Rather, these frameworks give expression to exceptions which may differ from one nation to another in accordance with the specific prevailing customs among the nations.

Despite the fact that the propagandists of Arab socialism have failed to present a new genuine content for socialism by giving it an Arab framework, they, by this stance of theirs, have confirmed that fact which we have mentioned: that the *ummah*, by virtue of its sensitivity due to the period of colonization, can only build the modern renaissance on a firm basis which, in the mind of the *ummah*, is not connected with the countries of the colonialists.

Here a big difference emerges between the methods used in the European economy which are connected, in the mind of the *ummah* with the colonialists — no matter what frameworks these methods are given — and the Islamic method which is, in the mind of the *ummah*, linked with its own history and glory, is an expression of its nobility of descent and does not bear any stamp of the countries of the colonialists.

The feeling of the *ummah* that Islam is the expression of its very self, the sign of its historical personality and the key to its former glory is a very great factor of success in the battle against backwardness and along the road towards development, if the method is adopted from Islam and if a framework for the starting point is taken from the Islamic system.

Apart from the complex feeling of the *ummah* in the Islamic world in face of colonialism and all methods connected with the countries of the colonialists, there is another complication which also greatly hinders the success of the modern methods of the European economy if they are applied in the Islamic world. This complication is the incompatibility between these methods and the religious belief

of the Muslims. I do not want to talk about this incompatibility here, so that I can make a comparison between the religious standpoint and the standpoint adopted by those methods. Nor do I want to give preference to the former over the latter — that is, I do not want to discuss this incompatibility from the ideological or religious points of view. However, I will try to present this incompatibility between the methods of the Europeans and the religious belief of the Muslims as a force within the Islamic world regardless of its value. However much we have believed it (this force) to be suffering from disunity and disintegration as a result of what colonialism did to its detriment in the Islamic world, it still has great influence in directing attitudes, raising feelings and determining opinions. It has already been explained that the process of economic development is not merely a process which the state applies and adopts and for which it legislates; it is a process in which the whole *ummah* participate and have a share in one way or another.

If the *ummah* is aware of any incompatibility between the supposed framework for development and a belief which it still feels strongly about and some of whose opinions on life it still retains, then it (*the ummah*) will, according to the extent it combines with that belief, shrink from the process of development and from being incorporated into its supposed framework.

Contrary to that, the Islamic system is not faced with this complication and is not afflicted with that type of incompatibility. Rather, if it is applied, the Islamic system will find in the spiritual doctrine great support and a contributive factor in the success of development planned within its framework. This is because the Islamic system is based on the principles of the Islamic *shari`ah* (revealed law). Muslims generally believe in the sacredness and inviolability of these principles and that they should be implemented in accordance with their Islamic faith and their belief that Islam is a religion which was revealed to

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

the seal of the prophets (Muḥammad — s. a. w. a.) .

There is no doubt that the most important factors in the success of the methods which are adopted for the regulation of social life are people's respect for these methods and their belief that these methods have the right to be implemented and applied.

Assuming that a practice of economic development based on the methods used in the European economy were able to do away with the religious doctrine and its passive force in face of those methods, this would not be sufficient to destroy all that has been built on the basis of this belief over a period of four centuries or more and has played a great part in the shaping of man's spiritual and intellectual framework in the Islamic world. Just as doing away with the religious belief does not mean that a European base has been procured for those methods which succeeded at the hands of the Europeans because they had found a suitable base capable of combining with them.

In fact, there is an Islamic moral practice which is to a certain degree prevalent in the Islamic world and there is the moral practice of the European economy which accompanied the modern western civilization and which move for it its general spirit and facilitated its success on the economic level.

The two moral practices are fundamentally very different in tendency, outlook and their appraisal of things: in the same measure as the moral practice of the modern European man lends itself to the methods of the European economy, the moral practise of the people of the Islamic world will be in conflict with it. The moral practice of the Islamic world is deep-rooted and cannot possibly be eradicated merely by diluting the religious belief. Just as the plan — the plan of battle against backwardness — must take into account the resistance of nature to the extent of its revolt against the methods of production in the country for which the plan is intended. The plan must also take into account the resistance of the human race and the extent

to which the latter can harmonize with this or that plan.

The Europeans always look at the earth, not at heaven, even Christianity which the Europeans have believed in for hundreds of years has not been able to triumph over the worldly inclination of the European man. Instead of lifting his gaze up to heaven, the Europeans managed to make the god of Christianity descend from heaven to earth and incarnate him as an earthly being.

The scientific efforts to trace the origin of mankind in the animal species and to explain his humanity on the basis of subjective conditioning to the earth and the environment in which man lives, or the scientific efforts to explain the whole human structure on the basis of the productive forces which represent the earth and the potentialities on it are merely an attempt to make God descend to earth, even though those efforts may differ in method and scientific or mythical character.

This looking at the earth has made the European man create values for material things, wealth and possession which are in keeping with that attitude.

These values which have taken root in the European man over the years have been able to express themselves in ideologies based on pleasure and gain which swept away moral philosophical thought in Europe. These ideologies, as a product of European thought which registered great success on the intellectual level in Europe, have their spiritual importance and are an indication of the general mood of the European spirit.

These special values for material things, wealth and possession have played a great role in using the energy bottled up inside every individual of the *ummah* and in establishing aims for the process of development which are compatible with those values. In this way, there was in all parts of the *ummah* a continuous active movement simultaneous with the rise of the modern European economy; a movement which would never feel weary of nor sated with material things, their benefits

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

and the possession of those benefits.

Likewise, the European man's severance of the true link with God, the Most High, and his looking at the earth instead of heaven has removed from his mind any real thought of a more sublime value or of restrictions imposed on him from outside his own domain. Moreover, that has inclined him both spiritually and mentally towards belief in his right to freedom and has submerged him in a flood of feeling for independence and individuality. This was then to be translated into the language of philosophy or expressed on the philosophical level by a greater philosophy in the modern history of Europe, and this was existentialism, since existentialism crowned with the philosophical form those feelings which pervaded the modern European man. Thus, he found in existentialism his hopes and his feelings.

Freedom has played a major role in the European economy. It has been possible for the process of development to benefit from the deep-rooted feeling for freedom, independence and individuality pervading the Europeans in the success of the free economy, as a device which is compatible with the deep-rooted inclinations and ideas of the European peoples. Even when the European economy presented a socialist method, it also tried to base itself on the feeling of individuality and selfishness, but this time it was class individuality instead of the individuality of a person.

The absence of any feeling of moral responsibility was a basic precondition in many of the activities which were part of the process of development. And all of us know that it was the deep feeling of freedom which prepared the ground for the fulfilment of this precondition.

Freedom itself was instrumental in the European man's understanding of the struggle because it made each person burst forth, only restrained by the existence of the other person stand-

ing in front of him. For each individual, by his very existence, would deny the other person his freedom.

In this way, the notion of the struggle developed in mind of the European man. This concept has been expressed on the philosophical level just like the rest of the fundamental concepts which produced the vein of the modern Western civilization. This concept — the concept of the struggle — was expressed in the scientific and philosophical ideas about the struggle for existence as a natural law among the living, about the inevitability of the class struggle in the society or about dialectics and the explanation of existence on the basis of the thesis and its antithesis and the compound arising from the struggle between opposites.

In fact, all these tendencies, whether scientific or philosophical, are above all an expression of a general spiritual reality and a strong awareness of the struggle among the people of the modern civilization.

The struggle greatly influenced the direction of the modern European economy and all the development procedures which accompanied it, whether it was a struggle between individuals which was expressed in the frantic and unlimited rivalry, under the auspices of the free economy, between the various institutions and the capitalist plans of various individuals which were increasing and promoting universal wealth through their struggle and fight for survival, or whether it was a struggle between classes which was expressed in revolutionary gatherings which took control of production in the country and set in motion all forces for the benefit of economic development.

This is the moral practice of the European economy and on this ground the economy has been able to begin its movement, effect its growth and register its enormous gains.

This moral practice differs from the moral practice of the *ummah* in the Islamic world as a result of its long religious history. The Eastern man who was brought up on the Divine messages

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

which were present in his country and who went through an extensive religious upbringing at the hands of Islam, by native, look at heaven before looking at the earth and embraces the world of the *ghayb* (unseen, invisible) before embracing material things and that which is perceptible through the senses.

His profound infatuation with the world of the "unseen" over and above the visual world was expressed on the intellectual level in the life of the Muslims. Consideration of the Islamic world was directed towards the intellectual domains of human knowledge, not the domains which are connected with the tangible reality.

His profound feeling for the invisible world has curbed the force of the Muslim man's attachment to material things and their ability to stimulate him.

When the man in the Islamic world rids himself of the spiritual incentives to interact with material things and his attachment to their profitable use, he adopts a negative stance in face of them, a stance which takes the form of either abstinence, contentment or layness.

This feeling for the "unseen" has trained the Muslim to feel the presence of an invisible supervision which, in the conscience of the pious Muslim, is an expression of a clear responsibility in the presence of God, the Most High. In the mind of another Muslim, it is an expression of a restricted and guided mind. In any case, this feeling for the invisible keeps the Muslim man away from the feeling for individual and moral freedom in the way which the European man feels it.

As a result of the Muslim's feeling of an inner restriction with a moral basis for the good of the community in which he lives, he feels a strong bond with the group to which he belongs. The Muslim also perceives harmony between him and his community instead of the concept of the struggle which dominated modern European thought. The international framework of the

message of Islam which places the responsibility of its existence on a world-wide basis and its spreading with time and place on the bearers of this message has consolidated the Muslim's concept of the community.

The gradual interaction of the man in the Islamic world with an international message for the human community implants in him the feeling for internationality and the link with the community. If we regard this moral practice of the Muslim man as a reality in the existence of the *ummah*, then it might be possible to benefit from it in supplying a method for the economy inside the Islamic world. The method could then be placed within a framework accompanying this moral practice, in order to produce a driving force. Just as the moral practice of the methods used in the modern European economy was a major factor in the success of those methods when there was harmony between the two.

The Muslim's contemplation of heaven before the earth may lead to a negative stance with regard to the earth and the wealth and benefits on it. This stance may find visual expression in abstinence, contentment and laziness, if the earth is separated from heaven. However, if the earth is given the framework of heaven and work with native is accorded the quality of "duty" and the meaning of "worship", then the Muslim's contemplation of the "unseen" will transform into a driving force for the greatest possible participation in the raising of the economic level. Instead of the coldness towards the earth which the negative Muslim feels today or the spiritual uneasiness which the active Muslim frequently feels who moves in accordance with the methods of the free or socialist economies, there will be complete harmony between the disposition of the man in the Islamic world and his future positive role in the process of development, even if he is not a very committed Muslim.

The Muslim man's concept of this inner restriction and invisible supervision prevents him from experiencing the notion

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

of freedom in the way the European man understands it. This concept may to a great extent help in averting the difficulties arising from the free economy and the problems confronting economic development under its protection, by means of a general plan which, in the mind of the Muslim man, draws its legitimacy from his concept of the inner restriction and invisible supervision, that is, this plan must be based on the justification of a moral practice.

In addition to what has already been mentioned, it is possible for the community and the link with it to participate in mobilizing the forces of the Islamic *ummah* for the battle against backwardness, if the battle is given a slogan which is in accordance with that feeling, like the slogan of *jihād* to protect the *ummah*.

The Holy Qur'an has ordered *jihād*: *And prepare against them what force you can. . .* (8:60). Thus, the Qur'an has ordered the preparation of all forces, including all economic forces represented by the level of production, as a part of the battle and *jihād* of the *ummah* to preserve its existence and sovereignty.

Here emerges the importance of the Islamic economics as the economic method capable of benefiting from the moral practice of the Muslim man (which we have already seen) and the transformation of this moral practice into a driving force in the process of development and the success of a healthy plan for economic life.

When we adopt the Islamic system, we will be able to benefit from this moral practice and mobilize it in the battle against backwardness, contrary to if we adopt economic methods which are connected, both spiritually and historically, with the ground of another moral practice.

Some European thinkers have also begun to realize this fact and become fully aware that their methods are not in accordance with the nature of the Islamic world. As an example, I will cite Jacques Oustravi (?). He has plainly recorded this observation in

his book *Economic Growth*, despite of the fact that he has failed to bring out the tactical and logical sequence of the existence of the European moral practice and the rise of the Islamic moral practice and the organization of its circles and has omitted some of the diversions of the two moral practices. Thus, he has embroiled himself in a number of mistakes. It is possible to rely completely on the exposive of these mistakes by the venerable Professor Muḥammad al-Mubarak in his introduction to the book and by Dr. Nabil Şubḥi at-Ṭawīl who translated the book into Arabic. However, I would like to enlarge on this subject at the nearest opportunity. For the moment, though, I will content myself with saying that the Muslim man's inclination to heaven does not in its basic sense mean the submission of man to fate, his dependence on circumstances and opportunities and his feeling of incapacity to create and invent, as Jacques Oustravi (?) tried to suggest. Rather, this inclination of, the Muslim man is, in fact, an expression of the beginning of the *khilāfah* (caliphate) of man on earth. This, by nature, he inclines to the realization of his position on earth as God's *khalīfah* (caliph). I do not know a concept more rich than the concept of caliphate to God, as conformation of man's capability and his powers which make him the caliph of the Absolute Master (Allāh) in the universe. Likewise, I do not know a meaning further from the true meaning of caliphate to God than submission to fate and circumstances. This is because caliphate infers responsibility towards that over which one is appointed caliph and not responsibility without freedom, feeling of choice and authority to pass arbitrary judgement on conditions. Otherwise, what sort of caliphate is this, if man is restricted or directed?

Therefore, we have said that given the earth the framework of heaven creates an outlet for the forces of the Muslim man and stimulates his capabilities. Whereas separating the earth from heaven makes caliphate meaningless and freezes the Muslim

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

man's contemplation of the earth in a negative external form. For negativism does not spring from the very nature of the Muslim's contemplation of heaven, but from the suspension of the great driving forces in this contemplation, as the earth is given to man within a framework which is not in harmony with that contemplation.

In addition to all that has gone before, we may observe that the adoption of Islam as a basis for general organization allows us to establish all of our life, both spiritually and socially, on one basis. This is because Islam covers both the spiritual and social sides of life while many of the other social systems are limited to the social economic relations of the life of man and others like him. Thus, if we take our general programs for life from human sources instead of the Islamic system, we will not be able to do without another organization for the spiritual side of life. Moreover, Islam is the only suitable source for the organization of the spiritual life. Thus, it is necessary to have one basis for both the spiritual and social sides of life, particularly since the two sides are not isolated from one another. Rather, they largely interact with one another, and this interaction makes there being one basis for the two more sound and more harmonious, considering the definite intertwining of spiritual and social activities in the life of man.

Muḥammad Bāqir aṣ-Ṣadr
an-Najaf — Iraq.

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

In the name of Allāh, the Merciful, the Compassionate

Dear readers, when we went our different ways at the end of the book *Falsafatunā* (Our Philosophy), we agreed to meet again. I told you before that *Falsafatunā* is the first of our Islamic studies. It is a study which deals with the lofty Islamic structure — the ideological structure of unity — followed by studies which are connected with the final touches in that Islamic structure, so that, at the end, we will have a complete mental picture of Islam, as a living doctrine in the heart of man, a complete system of life and a special method in education and thought.

We stated this in the introduction to *Falsafatunā*. We assumed that *Our Society* would be the second study in our research in which we would discuss the ideas of Islam concerning mankind, his social life and his method of analyzing and explaining the social compound. It was our intention to finish with that, then move on to the third stage — to the Islamic system for life which

IQTİŞÂDUNÂ

is connected with the social ideas of Islam and which is based on its firm ideological structure. However, the insistent desire of the readers was that we should defer *Our Society* and begin with the publication of *Iqtisâdunâ* (Our Economics) since they are eager to be acquainted with a detailed study of the Islamic economics, its philosophy, its fundamentals, its outlines and its directives.

Therefore, we have devoted ourselves to completing *Iqtisâdunâ* in an attempt to present in it a relatively complete picture of the Islamic economics, as we understand it today from its sources.

I was hoping that this meeting of ours would be sooner. However, overpowering circumstances resulted in some delay, despite of the effort I exerted along with my dear assistant, the most erudite and venerable, Muḥammad Bâqir al-Hakim, to complete this study and present it to you in the shortest time possible.

* * * * *

I would like to say here above all something about the words "Our Economics" or the words "Islamic Economics" about which the studies of this book are concerned. I would like to say what I mean by these words when I use them because the word "Economy" has a long history in human thought. This long history has given this word some measure of obscurity as a result of the various meanings which are applied to it and the coupling in meaning between the scientific and doctrinal sides of the economy. Thus, when we want to know the exact meaning of the Islamic economics, we must distinguish the science of the economy from the economic doctrine and become aware of the extent of interaction between scientific and doctrinal thought, in order that we may finish with that and move on to determine what is meant by the Islamic economics to the study of which we devote ourselves in this book.

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

The science of the economy is: the science which deals with the exposition of economic life, its events, its outward signs and the connection of those events and outward signs with the reasons and general factors which control them.

This science has recently come into being — in fact, to take the exact meaning of the word, it only came into force at the start of the Capitalist age, around about four centuries ago — even though its primitive roots extend into the depths of history. Every civilization has participated in economic thought as far as possible. However, the first exact scientific inference in the history of economics is indebted to recent centuries.

The economic doctrine of the society is an expression of the course which the society prefers to follow in its economic life and in solving of its practical problems.

On this basis, it is not possible for us to imagine a society without an economic doctrine because every society which practises the production and distribution of wealth must have a method on which it agrees in organizing these economic activities . . . And it is this method which determines its doctrinal position with regard to economic life.

There is no doubt that the choice of a specific method for the organization of economic life is not absolutely arbitrary. Rather, this choice is always based on particular ideas and concepts with a moral or scientific stamp or some other characteristics. These ideas and concepts produce the intellectual balance of the economic doctrine based on them. When a certain economic doctrine is studied, it must be dealt with in respect to its method in the organization of economic life and its balance of ideas and concepts with which the doctrine is connected. If we study, for example, the capitalist doctrine advocating economic freedom, then it is necessary for us to examine the fundamental ideas and concepts on which Capitalism's glorifying of and belief in freedom are based.

This is the situation with regard to every doctrinal study. Ever since the birth of economics, its path has passed through the field of economic thought. Some scientific theories on the economy have begun to shape a part of the intellectual balance of the doctrine.

When the merchants for example — and they are the precursors of modern economic thought — claimed that they explained the amount of wealth each nation possessed from the scientific point of view as: the extent to which the nation is in possession of ready money, they used this idea in laying down their commercial doctrine. Thus, they encouraged foreign trade, as the only way of obtaining ready cash from abroad, and established an economic policy which would lead to the value of exported goods exceeding the value of imported goods, so that ready cash would come into the country in accordance with the increase in exports.

When the naturalists came up with a new interpretation of wealth based on the belief: that agricultural production not trade and industry, is the only production which guarantees the growth of wealth and the creation of new values, they established in the light of the so-called scientific interpretation a new doctrinal policy which aims at work for the flourishing and advancement of agriculture, as the basis of all economic life.

When Maltis (?) in the light of his scientific calculations established his famous theory: that the growth of mankind is relatively more rapid than the growth of agricultural production and that this would definitely lead to a great famine in the future of mankind, on account of the number of people exceeding the amount of foodstuffs, he propagated birth control and set out political, economic and moral methods for this propagation.

When the socialists explained the value of the commercial article as work expended in the production of this article, they condemned capitalistic gain and embraced the socialist doctrine

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

in distribution. This doctrine believes that the worker is the only one who has the right to the product since he is the only creator of the value which the product enjoys.

Thus, all scientific theories have begun to influence the doctrinal view and light up the way for doctrinal scholars.'

After that came the part of Marx. He added something new to the intellectual balance in the economic doctrine and that was the science of history or what he called "Historical Materialism" in which he claimed that he had discovered natural laws which controlled history. He expressed the doctrine as an inevitable result of these laws. In order that we should be acquainted with the economic doctrine which must prevail at a specific stage in history, we should consult those unalterable laws of the nature of history and discover the requirements in that stage.

On account of that, Marx believed in the socialist and communist doctrine as the inevitable result of the laws of history which began to produce this doctrine in this stage of the life of man. Therefore, the economic doctrine was counted with the school of the science of history just as it was linked before that with some of the studies in economics.

On this basis, when we use the words "the Islamic economics", we do not mean by that directly "economics" because economics is a relatively new science and because Islam is a missionary religion and a way of life, its real job is not the pursuit of scientific studies . . . Rather, we mean by "the Islamic econ-

-
1. We must observe here that many of the scientific theories in economics have an extremely negative attitude with regard to the doctrine, just like the theories which explain various matters of economic life set out within a firm doctrinal framework. The doctrinal view is directly influenced by the theories which deal with general matters in the economic field, not relative matters set out within this or that particular framework.

omics": the economic doctrine of Islam which embodies the Islamic system in the organization of economic life on the strength of the balance of thought this doctrine possesses and denotes and which is made up of the moral ideas of Islam and the scientific, economic or historical ideas which are linked with the problems of economics or the analysis of the history of human societies.

So, we mean by "the Islamic economics": the economic doctrine observed within its complete framework and in its link with the intellectual balance on which it depends and which explains the doctrine's point of view in respect to the issues with which it is concerned.

This intellectual balance is determined for us in accordance with direct announcements or the light which the same doctrine throws upon the matters of the economics and history. Thus, the scientific amalgamation of Islam in the studies of economics or "Historical Materialism" is the philosophy of history . . . and can be studied and investigated through the doctrine which it embraces and propagates.

When we want to be acquainted with, for example, the opinion of Islam, from the scientific point of view, on the exposition of the value of the commodity, the determination of its source, how the value of the commodity arises and whether this value is acquired as a result of work alone or some other factors, we must examine Islam's doctrinal point of view with regard to capitalist gain and the extent of its acknowledgement of the fairness of this gain.

When we want to know the opinion of Islam on the truth of the role which capitalism, the tools of production and work play in the process of production, we must study the rights which Islam has given to each of these elements in the field of distribution, as is lawful according to the principles of "letting",

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

“silent partnership”, “*musāqāt*”¹, “*muzāra`ah*”², “sale” and “loan”.

When we want to know the opinion of Islam on Maltis' aforementioned theory, regarding the enormous increase in population, we may understand it in the light of Islam's stance with regard to its general policy of birth control.

If we should want to find out Islam's opinion on "Historical Materialism" and the alleged developments of history in it, we may discover this by examining the constant nature of the economic doctrine in Islam and its belief in the possibility of this doctrine being applied in all stages of history through which man has lived ever since the appearance of Islam, and so on.

* * * * *

And now, having defined the meaning of "the Islamic economics" in a way which will make easy the understanding of future studies, we must discuss briefly the chapters of the book. In the first chapter, the book deals with the Marxist doctrine, bearing in mind that he possesses a practical balance which finds visual expression in "Historical Materialism". First of all, we examined this intellectual balance. Then, we moved on directly to a criticism of the doctrine. We left that subject, having destroyed the alleged scientific fundamentals on which the doctrinal essence of Marxism is based.

The second chapter is devoted to the study and criticism of capitalism and the determining of its relationship with economics.

-
1. “*Musāqāt*”, a share-cropping contract over the lease of a plantation limited to one crop year (Islamic Law).
 2. “*Muzāra`ah*”, a temporary share-cropping contract (Islamic Law)

The study of the Islamic economics begins directly in the third chapter. In that chapter we discussed a number of the basis ideas on this economics. Then, we moved on to the particulars in other basic principles, in order to describe the system of distribution and production in Islam, on the strength of the particulars the two systems comprise with regard to: the distribution of the natural wealth, the limitations of private ownership, the principles of balance, mutual agreement, collective responsibility, the financial policy, the mandatory power of the government in economic life, the role of the elements of production: work, capitalism and the tools of production, and the right of each to the wealth produced, plus all the other different aspects which have a share in the presentation of the complete clearly defined picture of the Islamic economics.

Finally, there remain a number of points connected with the studies of the book, particularly in the last chapters which examine the details of the Islamic economics; and they must be noted down from the beginning :

a) The Islamic views on that which is connected with the juristical sides of the Islamic economics are presented in this book in a way which is free from the methods of deduction and scientific research which are employed in the wider juristical studies. When these views are supported by Islamic documents, such as verses and narratives, by that is not meant the scientific evidence of the legal principle, because proof of the principle with a verse or a narrative does not mean simply the rendition of this verse or narrative. Rather, this evidence requires such depth, exactness and comprehension that is beyond the purpose of the writing of this book.

Over and above the occasional presentation of those verses and narratives, we have in view the procuring of a general piece of knowledge for the reader, supported by Islamic documents.

b) The juristical opinions which are presented in the book

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

do not need to be taken from the author himself, for the book deals with opinions which are juristically at variance with the "*ijtihād*"¹ of the book on the matter. However, the general characteristic which has been greatly observed in those opinions is: that they are the result of the *ijtahād* of one of the "*mujtahids*"², irrespective of the number of people holding the opinion and the stance of the majority with regard to it.

c) The book sets forth legal principles in a general way, without going into particulars and precepts outside their domain, in view of the fact that the book does not extend to all details and branches.

d) The book always confirms the link between the Islamic principles but that does not mean that they are principles which are connected with an independent legal meaning, such that, if some of those principles are not used, the rest will become null and void. Rather, by that is meant that the philosophy which is aimed at over and above those principles cannot be fully realized without Islam being applied, as a whole, and not divided, even if it is necessary in reality to obey each principle, regardless of whether one obeys or disobeys another principle.

In the book there are divisions of some aspects of the Islamic economics which were obviously not intended in a legal text. Rather, they have been taken from all the legal principles to do with the matter. Therefore, those divisions precisely follow the ex-tent to which those legal principles are in conformity with them.

In the book terms arise which can be misunderstood. Therefore, we have explained their meaning in accordance with our

-
1. "*Ijtihād*", the formulation of an independent judgement in a legal or theological question (Islamic Law).
 2. "*Mujtahid*", a legist, formulating independent decision in legal or theological matters.

IQTİŞÂDUNÂ

understanding of them, in order to avoid any ambiguity. For example, the term "State Ownership", according to our understanding of it, means: all property belongs to the Divine Office in the State. This is the property of the State and whomever occupies the office personally or as a deputy, to deal with it in accordance with what Islam has stipulated.

* * * * *

This book does not deal with the external form of the Islamic economics alone and is not concerned with being a literary model, with numerous 'bulky' words and meaningless generalizations. Rather, it is an initial attempt — whatever its success and elements of creativity — to delve into the depths of economic thought in Islam and to succeed as a model of thought, on which a lofty structure for the Islamic economics could be based; a structure which is rich in its philosophy and fundamental ideas, clear in its character, particularities and general tendencies, clearly defined as to its relationship with and its stance in respect to the other great economic doctrines, and linked with the complete organic structure of Islam . . .

This, it is necessary for the book to be studied as a primitive seed of .pat imposing Islamic structure. The book was required to philosophize on the Islamic economics by looking at economic life and the history of mankind and to explain the economic content of this economy.

I have no happiness except by God's leave. I trusted in Him and to Him I turn in repentance.

Muḥammad Bâqir aş-Şadr
an-Najaf al-Ashraf
IRAQ

Volume One

Part One

CHAPTER ONE

M A R X I S M

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

- I - INTRODUCTION**
- II - THE THEORY IN THE LIGHT OF
PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS**
- III - WHAT IS THE THEORY IN GENERAL**
- IV - THE THEORY WITH ITS DETAILS**

1- INTRODUCTION

When we undertake the examination of Marxism in the sphere of economics, it will not be possible for us to take a part of its doctrinal aspects, exemplified by socialism and Marxist communism, from its scientific aspect exemplified by historical materialism whereby Marxism claims it has determined the general scientific laws, governing the human history and has discovered in these laws the inevitable system for every stage of history in the life of man and its transformed conditions with the passage of time.

The firm bond of co-relation between the doctrine of Marxism and historical materialism will be brought more and more to view in the course of our future discussions and in the light of it, it will be seen in all its lucidity and precision that the doctrinal Marxism is nothing but a definite historical stage, a relatively limited expression of the absolute material conception of history. Hence it will not be possible for us to pass judgement in respect of Marxist doctrine qua a doctrine with its particular

tendencies and features except after we have exhaustively examined the ideological basis on which it is reared up, and have determined our stand point in respect of historical materialism qua the direct principle of the doctrine and the well ordered edifice of the laws of economics and history which, according to the assumption of Marxism dictates to the society the doctrine of its economic life in correspondence with its historical stage and its particular material conditions.

Historical materialism, provided it acquits itself of its scientific examination and is successful therein, will be the highest resort in determining the economic doctrine and the Social system for every historical stage in the life of man and it will become necessary that every economic and social doctrine, be studied within the framework of its laws and in their light, as it would be that credence be refused to be given to any economic and social doctrine which claims for itself exhaustively comprehensive sufficiency and feasibility for several different epochs of history like Islam which believes in the possibility of its maintaining the society and its economic and social relations on the basis of its system, irrespective of the what so ever of the changes that have taken place in its civil and material conditions within the fourteen centuries. It is on account of this that Engels, states — on the basis of historical materialism explicitly.

The conditions under which men produce and exchange vary from country to country and within each country again from generation to generation. Political economy, therefore, cannot be the same for all countries and for all historical epochs. (Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, [Arabic transl.] , vol.2, p.5)

But if it fails to discharge its assumed scientific function and in the analysis, it is proved that it does not explain the inexorable eternal laws of human societies, then at that time it will be natural to spurn out of door doctrinal Marxism which is established upon it, and then, there at, it will be scientifically

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

possible to adopt the very system, not like Islam which the laws of historical materialism do not determine and to claim, nay rather assume (postulate) for it that universality and that feasibility of comprehensiveness which is incompatible with the Marxist logic of history.

We, therefore, find it necessary for every inquirer into the doctrine of economics, to subject to exhaustive examination of historical materialism in order to justify his standpoint in respect of that doctrine and to enable him to pass an over all basic judgement for or against Marxist doctrine of economics.

On this basis, we shall begin our inquiry about Marxism, with historical materialism, then we will take up (the subject of) the doctrine of Marxism, which rests upon it; or in other words we will study firstly, the Marxist theory of economics and the Marxist theory of history; and secondly, the Marxist doctrine of economics.

SINGLE FACTOR THEORIES

Historical materialism is a special methodology of the interpretation of history. In its interpretation it tends to single factor. This trend in historical materialism is not the only one of its kind for there is a large number of writers and thinkers who are inclined to the interpretation of history in terms of single factor inasmuch as they regard one factor out of the many operating effectively in realm of history as the magic key which unbolts locked up secrets and plays the chief role in the operations of history. They interpret the other influences as secondary and following the chief factor in their existence, developments, transformation and continuities.

* * * * *

One of the species of this trend, which consolidates the

IQTİŞÂDUNÂ.

motive force of history in a single factor is the opinion which holds race to be the highest source in the social field. It asserts that all the human civilizations and social cultures differ in proportion to the stored up wealth of the forces of drive and movement and the powers of creation and invention, inherent in the race and emerging therefrom, for it is the strong pure unmixed race which is the cause of all the phenomena of life in the human history and substratum of man's muscular and spiritual composition; and that history is nothing but a connected series of sequences of the phenomena of face to face fight between races and blood engaged in by the struggle of existence for survival, wherein victory is written for strong and pure blood while the weak nations die by the cutting sword of it, dwindling and becoming extinct because of being deprived of the powers which they could have had by virtue of their race, and because of the deficiency of their capacity for resistance which springs from purity of blood.

One of the interpretations of history in terms of a single factor is the geographical conception of history which regards geographical and physical factor as the basis of the history of nations and communities and that the history of people differ according to the difference between the geographical and physical environment which surrounds them since for it is that which at times opens up the way to higher culture, supplies then with abundant means of civilized life and causes ideas of causuration to spring up in their brain and that which at other times, shuts the door in their face and assigns to them the hindermost part in the procession of human cavalcade. Hence it is the geographical factor which shapes societies according to its nature and requirements.

* * * * *

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

And there is a third interpretation of history in terms of a single factor held by the psychologists. They say that it is sex instinct which underlies all the different human activities which go towards the making of history and society since man's life is nothing but a series of the conscious and unconscious drives and impulse of that instinct.

* * * * *

And the last of these endeavours which are inclined to the interpretation of history in terms of a single factor, is the historical materialism which Karl Marx heralds, asserting therein that the economic factor is the chief factor and the first guide to the origin and development of society and the creative force of all of its ideal and material contents and the various other factors are nothing but the superstructures is the social edifice of history, for they adjust themselves to this main factor and change in accordance with its driving force under which proceed the cavalcade of history and society.

These endeavours do not agree with reality nor does Islam acknowledge them for every one of them tries to contain in one factor the interpretation of the entire human life and to give to this factor that place in the epochs of history and merits of society which is not warranted on exhaustively minute consideration.

The main object of this discourse of ours is the study of historical materialism, not these single factor theories. We have mentioned them all here because they all share in common the expression of the trend of thought as to the interpretation of the social man in terms of a single factor

THE ECONOMIC FACTOR OR HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Now let us set down the general idea of the Marxist concep-

tion of history which adopts the economic factor as the one which really causes the human procession to move in all the fields, for Marxism believes that it is the economic formation which determines the social formation, political religious and ideological and such other manifestations of social existence. As for the economic formation, too, there is Cause as there is for all the earthly things and that the main cause of the social change collectively and subsequently for all the historical movements in the life of man — is the mode of productive forces and the means of production.

It is the means of production which is the mighty force which makes the history of people, causes their development and organizes them: In this way Marxism puts its hand at the top end of the thread, and reaches with its ascending chain to the first cause as to the historical process in its entirety.

Here two questions crop up: What are these means of production and how has the historical movement and the whole of social life, originated from it?

To the first question Marxism replies: The means of production are the tools which man employs for the production of his material needs, for this man is obliged to wage war with nature for his existence and this war calls for a strong physique and definite kind of tools which man employs for husbanding nature and for rendering it fruitful for his good. The first tool which he employed in his service in this field was his hand and arm. Then other tools slowly began to appear in his life. He made use of tools for the purpose of cutting, grinding and hammering and was able, after a long journey of history to fix a massive piece of stone on a handle and to fashion a hammer. Then the hand became of service for fashioning tools for production and not for direct production. The production became dependant upon separate tools and the tools began to grow and develop whenever man's mastery over nature increased. He then fashioned stone

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

– hoe axes, stone-spears and stone knives. He was then able to invent the bow and arrow and made use of them for hunting. In this manner the productive forces began to grow gradually, slowly during thousands of years till they reached the present stage of history wherein the steam, electricity and atoms have become the forces on which the modern productions depend. And these are the productive forces which manufacture for man his material needs and requirements.

And also to the second question Marxism replies: The productive forces beget the historical movement in accordance with the changes and inconsistencies arising therein and explains this by saying that the productive forces go on growing and developing constantly as we have seen, and for every definite stage of the development of these productive forces and the means of production there is a particular mode of production and the produces which depend upon simple stone-tools, differ from the produces which depend upon bows and arrows and such other weapons of hunting and the produces of the hunter differ from the produces of the keeper of the herd and tiller of the soil. In this way, there is, for every stage of human society a particular mode of production in keeping with the kind of the productive forces and the degree of their growth and development.

Men do not act singly and in isolation from each other when in war with nature for the production of their material needs but do so in groups and in their capacity as members of a group knit together and their production will be the social production, whatsoever the conditions be, then it is but natural that there may emerge people between whom definite relations are formed in their capacity as a collected group together by joint ties in their productive operations.

These relations, the relations of production which are formed between people by reason of their united plunge into the fight against nature, are in fact, the ownership relations which deter-

mine the economic formation and the method of distribution of the wealth produced collectively; or in other words, they determine the forms of ownership, tribal, slave feudal or capitalist or communist, and the kind of the owner as well as the status of every individual in respect of the social products.

These relations, are deemed, from the Marxist point of view, to form the true basis on which stands the entire social superstructure and all the relations, political, legal, and ideological and religious manifestations rest upon the foundation of the relations of production (relations of ownership) inasmuch as it is these relations of production which determine the form of ownership prevailing in the society and agreeably to the style and in which it completes the distribution of the wealth among its individual members and this in turn, determines its political legal, ideological and religious form in a general way.

But if all the social formations grow in conformity with its economic formation or in other words, grow in conformity with their relations of production (relations of ownership) then it becomes necessary to ask the question in respect of these relations of production, how they grow and what is that cause which brings them into existence and gives shape to its socio-economic formation.

Historical materialism replies to this: Relations of production (relations of ownership) come into existence necessarily in conformity with the mode of production and to the specified determinate degree in which the productive forces exist for every degree of the growth of these productive forces, there are relations of productions and (socio) economic formation conforming to that degree of their growth. Hence it is productive forces which brings into existence the (socio) economic formation which it requires and imposes upon society. Then it is from the (socio) economic formation and the relationship of ownership that all social formations are begotten which conform to and agree

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

with them.

And the social existence continues in this state till such as the social productive forces reach that new degree of growth and development when they come in conflict with the existing (socio) economic formation for this formation which was the result of the new stage or degree as far as the productive forces had developed it to a new stage, demands a new (socio) economic formation and new relation of ownership in place of the last fashion, after the former economic formation becomes a feller on its growth and thus a conflict arises between productive forces for the means of production at the new stage on the one side and the relations of ownership and (socio) economic formation which are left by the previous stage of the productive forces, on the other.

Here comes the role of classism of the historical materialism, for the conflict between the growing productive forces and the existing relations of ownership always in the social sphere is the conflict between two classes, one of which belongs to the social class, the interests of which correspond with the interests of growing productive forces and the other class the interests of which correspond with the existing relations of ownership and which comes into class with rising requirements of the growth of productive force. For example, at the present historical stage, conflict is set up in society between the growth of productive forces and the relations of ownership and war has broken out in consequence of it between the working-class which ranges itself up on the side of the productive forces in their growth and refuses with persistence and class-consciousness the relations of capitalist ownership and the owner-class which takes up its position by the side of the capitalist relations in property and on shooting boots in the defense of it.

Thus the conflict between forces of production and the relations of ownership, always finds its social significance in class

conflict.

Then inherent in the nature of society there are two inconsistencies: The first, the conflict between the growing of the forces of production and the prevailing relations of ownership. When they become fetters to completion of their development and the second, the class conflict between the social class which engages itself in the fight on account of the productive forces and the social class which plunges in it on account of the existing relations; and this second conflict is the social expression and the direct reflection of the first conflict.

Since the means of production are the main forces in the realm of history, it is natural that it should emerge victorious in its fight with the relations of production and the remnants of the old stage (of history) and put an end to the economic formations which are in conflict with them and establish relations and economic formations which join in the procession of their growth and identify themselves with their stage.

And the meaning of it in social terms is that the social class which joins the rank of the productive forces in the fight is destined to gain victory over the social class which is in conflict with it and tries to preserve the status qua.

When the productive forces gain victory over the relations of ownership or in other words when the class which is the ally of the means of production over its opposite, these old relations of ownership are demolished and the face of the society is changed and changes in the economic formation in its turn shakes society's entire stupendous superstructure of politics, ideas, religions and moralities for all these wings stand on the basis of economic formation, so when the economic basis changes the entire face of society changes.

The matter does not end at this point for the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of ownership or the conflict between the two classes, the representative of these

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

forces and relations — this conflict, even if it finds its solution in the subsequent change of the entire social body, it is but a timely solution inasmuch as these productive forces go on attaining to their growth and development till they enter into conflict in second time, with the new relations of ownership and the new economic formations and suffers travel of labour of the birth of a new society the interests of which agree with the new growth of the productive forces and the new requirements of the society. Meanwhile, the class which was (hitherto) the ally of the productive forces becomes the enemy of it from the moment the means of production begin to conflict with its interests and some of the relations of ownership which it covets and the two classes get entangled in conflict afresh in a social indication of conflict between the productive forces and relations of ownership. And this duel ends with the very result to which the former had led it. That is the productive forces gain victory over the relations of ownership and consequently the class which is its ally triumphs and following this the economic formation and all the social formations change.

And thus the relations of ownership and the formations of economics continue to keep preserved their social existence as long as the productive forces keep operating under it and growing and when they become an obstacle in their path, conflicts begin to aggregate till a solution is found in the revolutionary burst up from which means of production emerge triumphant and the obstacle confronting it is demolished and a new economic formation is born and to the reoccurrence, after a period of its growth of a duel afresh in accordance with the dialectical laws till they are destroyed and history is moved on to a new stage.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AND THE CHARACTERISTIC OF FACTUALITY

Marxist have made it a practice of saying that historical

materialism which lined up with other sciences of human knowledge by a historical leap is the only scientific way for the apprehension of objective reality. In the same way some of the Marxist writers have tried to charge the opponents of historical materialism and the objectors to it as a method for the interpretation of social man with the accusation that they are the enemies of the science of history and of the objective reality which Marxism studies and explains. These people justify such an accusation of theirs on the basis of two things, one of which is belief in the existence of reality, the other is that historical events do not take place haphazardly or by chance but come into existence only in accordance with general laws which can be studied and be made understood. As such every objection to historical materialism is reduced to its being an opposition to these two.

It is on the basis of this that some one of the Marxists writes:

The enemies of history have made it a practice to interpret the differences in the apprehension of historical occurrences as a proof that there exists no sure knowledge as to an event having truly taken place. They assert that (when) we differ about events which took place a day before, how could we be sure about events which took place centuries before? (*Modern Culture*; [Arabic transl.] , no.1 1, year 7, p.10).

The writer wishes by this to explain every opposition to historical materialism as an attempt to skepticism as to history and historical occurrences being objective facts. The writer monopolizes in this way belief in the objective reality for his (school's) particular conception of history.

However, we for our assurance may ask whether this hostility to history means skepticism as to the existence of reality outside the (knowing) mind and its cognition or its denial?

The fact is, we find nothing new in these kind of (Marxist) pretexts in the field of history (for) we have come across these

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

kinds of pretexts in the field of philosophy (too), while we took up the study of philosophy in our work *Falsafatunā* (Our [Islamic] Philosophy). In that study of ours we found Marxists laying emphasis on the part that the materialist conception of the Universe is the only trend in the field of history for that trend takes for its basic belief in the objective reality of matter (so) the only answer to the philosophical question, when the inquiry is diverted from the material trend would be (belief in) idealism which does not believe in the objective reality and denies the existence of matter. As such there are only two alternatives to explain the world of being in idealist terms wherein there is no room for objective reality to exist independent of (knowing) mind and consciousness; or in terms of a scientific method on the basis of dialectical materialism. But as we have already stated this alternatively in philosophical discussion is spurious the object aimed at being to dub the opponents of political materialism as conceptual idealist in despite of the fact that the belief in this (objective) reality neither does it depend on (the acceptance of) dialectical materialism nor does its refusal mean, under any circumstance skepticism in respect of this reality or its denial ...

The same may be said in respect of our new field (history) that belief in the objective reality of the society and of the historical events does not result from acceptance of the material conception of history for there exists a true knowledge of historical events and that these events, whether relating to the present or the past, have actually taken place, in the definite form in which they are found or related and exist independent of the (knowing) mind or consciousness. As to this every one agrees. It is not a distinctive features of historical materialism, but every one who explains the events of history or its changes, whether in terms of ideas or in terms of natural, racial or any other factors believes in this, in just the same way as does Marxism which explains history in term of change in the productive

forces. Thus belief in the objective reality is the starting point for all these conceptions of history and the first axiomatic basis on which all these historical explanations are built up.

* * * * *

And another thing: Historical phenomena being part of the totality of the phenomena of nature are subject to the general laws which govern the entire Universe. The law of causation is one of these laws. According to this law no event be it historical, physical or of any other nature, comes into existence fortuitously or spontaneously (or the spur of the moment) but follows from a cause. Even effect is tied to its cause, every event is connected with its antecedent. So any talk of history which does not admit of the application of this principle the law of causation, in its field would be without meaning.

Belief in the objective reality of historical events and the conviction that these events follow in their occurrence the law of causation are the basic notions of all the scientific inquiry in respect of the interpretation of history and the controversy between different interpretations and trends in the study of history revolve round the basic causes and as to whether these are productive forces, or ideas or strains of blood, physical environments or all of these factors collectively. And the answer to the question would exclude none of these — whatever be their trend from being interpretations of history based on the belief in the (objective) reality of historical events and these events following from and in accordance with the law of causation.

* * * * *

In the following pages we will take up the study of historical materialism as a general method for the understanding and the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

interpretation of history and study.

First: Marxism's general conception of nature in the light of the philosophy and logic under which it is formulated.

Secondly: The nature of the General Theory which attempts to comprise within its the entire Human History.

Thirdly: The details of the theory which determines the different phases of human history and the social leap at the beginning of every such phase.

II- THE THEORY IN THE LIGHT OF PHILOSOPHICAL BASES

In the light of the philosophy of materialism Marxist believes that the distinctive feature of the new philosophy of materialism is its material interpretation of history, since it is not possible to give without it a correct interpretation of history agreeing completely with the philosophy of materialism and coinciding with the material conception of life and being in all its bearings. And as long as the material interpretation is true — in the opinion of Marxism — in the case of existence in general, it would be true in the case of history (also) since history is only a part of the general existence.

Marxism condemns the stand point of the 18th Century materialism in respect of the interpretation of history in that mechanical 18th Century materialism did not reconcile with this most powerful material discovery in the field of history, but was idealist in respect of its conception in despite of its being wedded to materialism in the general universal sphere. And why was it idealist in respect of its interpretation of history? It was such in the opinion of Marxism, because it believed in idealism and spiritual contents of humanity and assigned to it chief role in the (processes of) history and was not able, within the social relations in which it was living, to go beyond these idealist factors to the deepest source — to the material forces underlying the means of production. So for this reason, it did not arrive at the material

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

cause of history, nor was helped to success in forming a scientific care of historical materialism in conformity with the universal materialism. It only continued clinging to the superficial idealist interpretations which study only the surface of history and do not penetrates to its depth. Engels says:

And for us that in the realm of history old materialism becomes untrue to itself because it takes the ideal driving forces which operate there as ultimate causes, instead of investigating what is behind them, what are the driving forces of these driving forces. The inconsistency does not lie in the fact that ideal driving forces are recognized, but in the investigation not being carried further back behind these into their motive causes (*Socialist Interpretation of History*, [Arabic transl.] , p. 57) .

I do not intend within the scope of my present study to take up investigation of philosophy of materialism for I have dealt with it in my first book of this series (*Falsafatunã*) I only want here to inquire into the correlation which Marxism or some of the Marxist writers assume to exist between the philosophy of materialism and historical materialism by posing as a thesis, the following question. Is it necessary for us, on the basis of the philosophy of materialism, to interpret history in the same way as Marxism has done and build up its entire course of speedy journey from the dusky dawn of life to eternity in terms of the means of production?

The answer to this question according to us is, that we should differentiate clearly between the philosophical conception of materialism and its historical conception according to Marxism. Since it is the mixing up of the two conceptions with each other that has led to the above mentioned emphasis: On the correlation between them and on this that no philosophy of materialism which does not adopt Marxist conception of history can stand on its legs in the field of historical investigation or can completely

free itself from its idealist conception of history.

However, the fact is that materialism in its philosophical conception means that matter with its manifold manifestations is the only one reality which includes all the phenomena of nature and all varieties of existences within it and spiritualities and everything which comes within its bounds, such as ideas, senses, abstractions are only material products and precede of matter from the particular stages of its growth and development. Hence thought, howsoever high and elevated it be above matter appears in the glasses of the philosophy of materialism to be only the outcome of the functional activities of the brain. As such there exists no reality or its various facets outside the bounds of matter and matter requires no meaning, non-material so on the basis of this philosophical conception man's ideas and his spiritual contents and nature which exercises them are only different facets of matter, its developments and its activities.

This is the philosophy of materialism and its general outlook as regards man and nature and according to this philosophical outlook, it makes no difference whether man is taken to be the product of the material conditions and the productive forces or the conditions of production and its forces are the products of man, for as long as the man and his ideas, nature and its productive, forces are within the bounds of matter as assumed by philosophy of materialism, there is no harm, from the philosophical side, to begin the interpretation of history from either of the links of the chain of history (historical process) and take it as the first link in the social chain and just as it will be quite proper to begin with the means of production, and confer upon it the complete quality of the demiurge of history, and take it to be the highest cause of all the streams and currents of history. So in the same manner, it is feasible, from the point of view of the philosophy of materialism to begin with humanity as the starting point, for the interpretation of history, for to do so either way is one or the same thing according to the philosophy

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

of materialism.

From this it is evident that material trend in history, does not render Marxist conception of history inevitable, nor makes incumbent the reduction of man to the secondary rank in the ladder of history and estimation of him as a flaccid dough for the means of production to mould in whatever shape they choose.

It becomes, then necessary that the subject of history be studied independently of the subject of the philosophy of nature.

IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF DIALECTIC

Laws of dialectics are the laws which interpret every development and becoming in terms of conflict between the opposites in the internal contents of things for everything carries within it an opposite germ which is engaged in strife with its opposite and develops in conformity with the conditions of the strife. *

Marxism turns its attention to the application in its particular conception of these laws of the dialect, in the social field and to the employment of dialectic method for the analysis of historical phenomena. It takes the class-contradiction in the core of society to be the expression of the dialectic law contradiction which says: everything contains in the depth of it, its opposites and contradictions and looks at the social development as a dynamic motion emerging in conformity with the general dialectical laws which says everything develops not by mechanical motion and by external forces which drives it from behind but because of the contradictions which rise and spring forth in the heart of it (society) increase gradually by the heaping up of class- contradictions till the suitable time draws near to burst out by transforming along with it the (entire) structure and the system of the society in accordance with the dialectic law which says: that the gradual quantitative changes are transformed into timely quantitative

* See *Falsafatunã* (Arabic), pp.174-242

changes. In this way Marxism endeavoured to devise a richly green field in the sphere of history by way of its historical materialism for the general laws of dialectics..

Let us pause for a moment to ascertain what is the extent to which Marxism has achieved success in its historical dialectics. Marxism was able to put dialectal method in place of its historical analysis to a certain extent, but the results it arrived at were contrary to the nature of dialectic for by this it was dialectical but was not so in its ultimate signification and in its positive results as we shall see.

A– Dialectical Method:

Marxism did not keep confined the application of its dialectical method to the historical investigation, but took it up as a mark of distinction in its analytic investigations of all sides of nature and life (as mentioned in *Falsafatunâ*) except that it was not carried out in a conclusive manner on account of its vacillating between dialectical contradictions and the law of causation; for in its dialectical capacity it affirmed that growth and development arise from internal contradictions and that the internal contradiction is quite sufficient for explaining each and every phenomenon of nature without the need of any other force or external cause while from another side it acknowledges the relations of cause and effect and explains these or those phenomena by external causes and not by contradictions stored up in their depth. This vacillation is reflected in its historical analysis too, for, while it insists upon the existence of contradictions rooted in the heart of each and every social phenomena as sufficient for its rise and movement, from another side it acknowledges that the huge social edifice in its entirety and in its particular manner, stand upon one foundation and it is the forces of production and the political, economic and ideal forms, etc. are only the super-structures of this edifice and the reflections in another shape of

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the mode of production on which it is reared up. Then in that case the relation which exists between this structure of variegated colours and the mode of production is one of the cause and effect. This means that the super-structural social phenomena did not emerge by the dialectical method, in accordance with their internal contradiction but came into existence by causes external to their internal contents and by the efficacy of its foundation. Nay, we find more than this thing. The contradiction which in the opinion of Marxism, causes society to evolve is not class-contradiction which expresses one of the meanings of term, internal social contradiction, but it is only the contradiction between old ownership relations and the new productive forces here. There are, then, two independent things between which there arises contradiction, not one thing which carries contradiction within its care.

Apprehending this see-saw position of it, Marxism tried to bring about adjustment between these two matters by giving cause and effect dialectal sense and rejecting its mechanical sense and thus permitted itself to employ in its analytical processes the method of cause and effect in its particular dialectic frame. Marxist rejects that conception of causation in which the cause moves in a straight line, and in which it remains an external causal factor in relation to its effect, and the effect, negative in relation to its cause because such a conception of cause clashes with the conception of dialectics as well as with that of nature's process of self growth and self development, inasmuch as according to it effect cannot be conceived to come out richer and more augmented than its cause for this further richness and augmentation will remain unaccounted for therein — will have no cause for it. But such will not be the case with the cause which is concerned to have been engendered by its opposite. Such a cause will develop and multiply by its internal movement in accordance with what-ever of the opposite it consists of, to return to its opposite which engendered

it interact upon it, and realize itself by combining with it and forming a new synthesis, more self sufficient and richer than its cause and effect taken separately. This is what Marxism means by cause and effect, because it is in conformity with the dialectics and represents the dialectical, triad thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis.* In this triad, cause stands for the thesis effect for anti-thesis and their combination with each other the synthesis. The causation here is the process of growth and development by way of the birth of effect from its cause, that is the anti-thesis from thesis, and here the effect is not begotten negatively but is begotten augmented by internal conflict which gives birth to it and held in embrace by its cause it is made more developed and more complete in its synthesis.

Marxism employed the relation of cause and effect in this dialectic sense of it in the field of history. In a general way it did not depart from the dialectical method which it had adopted. It only interpreted society on the basis of it being a fundamental method on which the manifestations of society's superstructures rise from this foundation grow, interact with the foundation and produce by mutual interaction stages of social development in accordance with the story of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis (position, negation and negation of negation).

This description applies to Marxism if we take as exceptions some circumstances in which Marxism registers the failure of its dialectic method in the interpretation of historical events and is compelled to give mechanical interpretation of the development of society and historical events in those circumstances, though of course without admitting the failure. Here is what Engels writes:

The old primitive communities which have already been mentioned could remain in existence for thousand of years - as in India and among the slaves up to the present day - before intercourse with the outside world gave rise in their

* See *Falsafatunâ (Arabic)*, pp.176-7

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

midst the inequalities of property as a result of which they began to break up. (*Anti-Diihring* [Arabic transl.] , vol.2, p.8)

B'- Spuriousness of Historical Dialectic :

It is necessary that we indicate in connection with this topic our opinion on the dialectical method and on the causality in the dialectical sense. Here it is. This causality established on the basis of contradiction (thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis) does not rest upon science, nor upon analytical philosophy. Neither is there found a single experiment in the scientific field by the proof of which it is established like wise philosophical investigation rejects it in tote. We do not want to dilate on the study of this point as we have already done so elaborately in our general criticism of the dialectic (see our work *Falsafatunā*). But since we are in the field of history we may take some pains to present a sample of dialectical materialism. So as to make quite clear its inadequacy in the sphere of history as we have made quite clear its inadequacy in the sphere of philosophy (in our work *Falsafatunā*). Let us take a passage out of the work of Marx the leader of the historical dialectic. In this passage he has tried to make dialectical explanation of the evolution of the society towards capitalism and thereafter towards socialism. He writes about the labourer's private ownership of his means of production, saying:

The capitalist mode of appropriation; the result of the capitalist mode of production produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of the individual private property as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets with the inexorability of a law of Nature its own negation. This does not establish private property of the producer but gives him individual property based on the acquisition of the capitalist era. i.e. on co-operation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production. (*The Capital* [Arabic transl.],

vol.3, section ii, p.138)

Did you see how the effect grows, till it combined with its cause into a richer and fatter more self-sufficient synthesis. The labourer or the small artisan's ownership of his means of production is the thesis and the cause, the capitalist expropriation of these means of production and his ownership of them from him, that is the anti-thesis and the effect, where the effect growing and blossoming, forms by combining with its cause upto a more complete synthesis for the capitalist ownership suffers the birth pangs and gives birth to socialist ownership, wherein the artisan is returned (as) the owner of his means of production in a more complete form.

By a good luck, it is not enough to postulate the man as the thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis for the historical and natural occurrences, in order to fashion history and nature dialectically; for the dialectic which Marx has postulated did not go beyond being some kind of abstract dialect in the mind of Marx (a figment of his brow) and was not historical dialect for if it was, then where is that artisan's private property of the means of his production which is the cause of his capitalist appropriation of it, so that it may be said the opposite was begotten by its opposite and that the thesis gave birth to anti-thesis.

The private property of the artisan of the means of his production was not the cause which brought into existence the capitalist mode of production. The capitalist mode of production came into existence as a result of the transformation of the class of traders into capitalist producers and the accumulation of their wealth under definite conditions. The artisan's ownership of their means of production in a helter and scattered manner was an obstacle in the path of the those traders, who came to be employing the capitalist mode of production and to be growing avaricious to have added control over the means of production. Wielding more influence they were able to sweep away the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

obstacle from their path and seize from the hands of the artisans their means of production in a final and decisive manner to consolidate the elements of the capitalist mode of productions and extend its range and scope. Though it was the capitalist mode of production, yet it did not arise from the artisan's ownership of the means of production in the same way as the anti-thesis arises from the thesis. It arose from the circumstances of the class of traders and the accumulation of wealth with them to a degree which made them employ the capitalist mode of production and subsequently to gain control over the properties of the class of artisans or in one sentence, if the external factors like trade and commerce, exploitation of the colonies, discovery of mines - if these did not confer upon the merchants and traders fat property, and means and power to adopt the capitalist mode of production and subsequently stripping the artisans of their means (of production) to the last shred – if all these conditions did not create for them these possibilities, the capitalist mode of production would not have emerged into existence, nor would have the artisan's ownership have been able to create its opposite to bring into existence the capitalist mode of production and subsequently itself evolve socialist ownership.

Thus we do not find in the sphere of history, as we shall see shortly on our study of the historical materialism in its details and its stages just as we did not find in the sphere of nature, a single instance to which the laws of dialectics or causality in the dialectical sense are applicable.

C– Result Contradicts the Method.

What a cruel irony for Marxism as to what it had hoped for in respect of dialectical method, that it used this method in a manner, which led to results which were not dialectical. It was on account of this we said in the very beginning that Marxism's method of the analysis of history is dialectical but the content (meaning)

of the method is contradictory to its method, for while from one side it lays down that the class-contradiction which reflects the contradictions of the means of production and the ownership – relations is the only one main cause of the internal conflicts in the society and all the other contradictions merely arise from it, yet at the same time it lays down that the caravan of humanity is travelling inevitably on the road to effacement of the class from society for ever and that will be when the bells of victory will ring for the proletariat and the classless society is born and humanity enters into the stage of socialism and communism.

When the class and its contradiction would have disappeared from the society, then at that stage the tide of evolutionary process would have come to an end, the flame of eternal dynamic movement would have been extinguished and the miracle which would put out of commission the laws of dialectic would have occurred or else how would Marxism explain dialectical movement in classless society, as long as the class-contradiction has met its inevitable end and as long as the dialectical movement cannot arise except on the basis of contradiction?

We are still holding in our hand the ex-passage quoted shortly before, from the works of Marx in which he makes the private property of the artisan the thesis and considers capitalism the first negation (anti-thesis) and the socialism as the negation of the negation (synthesis). So we can ask Marx will then the matter of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis cease to operate after that in spite of general laws of dialectics or it will recommence a new triad? And if it re-continues then in that case, social property will become the thesis and which will be the contradiction which it will beget and will develop and increase by combining with it in unity? We can (in that case) postulate that the communist property is the contradiction or the first negation of socialism but which is the negation of the negation (synthesis).

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Indeed the dialectic will remain in a state of perplexity, in front of the emphasis from Marxism that communism is the supreme phase of the human revolution.

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Let us now study historical materialism in a new light — in the light of historical materialism itself. It might appear strange at a first sight of it that the theory should be made the means of pressing judgement upon itself, except that we shall find it from what follows that the historical materialism above will be sufficient for passing judgement upon itself in the field of scientific inquiry.

When historical materialism is a philosophy of the formation and development of the society, it will treat the subject of human ideas and human knowledge in general as a part of the formation of human society and give its opinion regarding the condition of the formulation of the human knowledge and its development just in the same way as it will give its opinion in respect of the condition of development and evolution of political religious and such other formations . . . And when the (socio-) economic formation, according to the views of historical (materialism) is the basic reality for all the sides of society then it is but natural that it should explain ideas and knowledge on the basis of it. On this account we find the historical materialism stressing that human knowledge is not born only of the functional activity of the brain but only conceals its original source, in the economic formation. Hence man's thought is a rational reflection of the economic formation and the social relation which exists therein and it is augmented and develops in accordance with the development of those formations and relations.

It is on the basis of this that Marxism has built up its theory of knowledge and professes the doctrine of evolutionary relativity. If the theory of knowledge, as long as it is constrained

to be born of the socio-economic circumstances it would be of relative value, confined within the bounds of those circumstances, and developing in accordance with them and as such there exists no absolute reality but realities are disclosed in relative shape within the orbit of the social relations and to the extent these relations permit.

This is the conclusion to which Marxism has arrived at by its analysis of societies, and this was conclusion which it could not but arrive at in keeping with its method of understanding of the society and history.

Though Marxism arrived at this conclusion yet in spite of it, it refused to apply this conclusion to its theory of history itself, declared historical materialism as an absolute truth, and made its inexorable laws as eternal laws, which admit of neither change nor modification nor do they suffer from any thing of impairment or lack of strength during the entire long course of history of the humanity. So much so that the Marxist understanding of history is the ultimate point of the entire human knowledge. Marxism, however, did not put itself to the trouble of asking the question, whence did arise this Marxist understanding of history? Or to have subjected it to its general theory of knowledge — (yes,) if it had put itself to the trouble of doing a little of this, incumbent upon it would have been forced to say that historical materialism as a definite theory arose within the socio-economic relations, and that it too like all other theories, follows from the objective circumstance in which it existed.

It is in this way that we find how historical materialism can pass judgement upon itself from the side from which it considers all every theory as a reflexion limited to the objective reality in which it exists and that it also in its turn does not exceed from being a theory which crystallized in the human mind in a definite socio-economic milieu in which it existed, so it is necessary that it should be a reflexion limited to that milieu and should develop in accordance with it. As such it cannot be an eternal truth of history.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Though we do not believe that the socio-economic relations are the only cause or source of the birth of theories and ideas, yet we do not deny their influence on the formation of many of the ideas and theories. We take for this, the material conception of history. I mean Marx's revolutionary conception of history. Marx behind the confrontation of the capitalist society or any other society (for that matter) will not come to an end except by revolutionary contest, between the two basic classes, to the bourgeois-class and the proletariat class. And from this it was led to regard revolution as the most general laws which governs the entire human history. After this come Marxists and instead of trying to uncover the social circumstances which flashed to the mind of Marx, the sudden idea of the positiveness of revolution and its historical necessity, they believed that revolution is the eternal law of history while it was not such in fact but an idea which came suddenly to the mind of Marx in which he lived and leaped to the times of absolute laws of history.

Marx lived contemporaneously with the 18th century capitalism, that capitalism distinguished by its characteristic politico-economical milieu. It appeared to him joining in a fierce revolution was the nearest to occur and the clearest of necessity for the comforts of life and rank misery, poverty and plenty were on the continuous increase without let or hindrance under the shelter of absolute capitalism and the political circumstance were oppressive and unjust to a great extent. It was this which caused to open up the mind of Marx to the idea of class-struggle, which was growing more grim and difficult as also augmenting in contradiction from day to day till the volcano would burst and solves the contradiction by revolution. This led Marx to the belief in revolution. Marx died and the social formations in Western Europe changed and politico-economic conditions in Western Europe began to move in the direction opposite to that which Marx had decreed for it. The contradiction did not become

IQTİŞÄDUNÄ.

serious nor did misery grew in extent or become wider but began to contract and to become less relatively. It was proved by political experiments that it was possible for the miserable mass to realise gainful importance by engaging in political fight without eruption of the bloody volcano.

The Marxist socialist began to take to different trends, one of which was democratic revisionist trend and the other was revolutionary trend. The first trend was the general trend which socialism took to in some of the countries in the region of Western Europe. It appeared to the socialist of these countries in the light of the social and political advancements they had made that revolution had become unnecessary. As for the second trend, it had gained control over the socialism in Eastern Europe, which had not witnessed the ideal and politico-economic circumstances resembling the circumstances prevalent in Western Europe. And there arose a conflict between the two trends round the interpretation of Marxism, on account of this trend or that trend and it was destined for the revolutionary trend to succeed, at last whereupon the revolutionary socialists hailed it and regarded it as a decisive proof and argument that revolutionary trend is that which embodies in it Marxism in all its absoluteness and eternity.

What all these people missed as Marx had missed before him, that they were not in front of an absolute eternal truth, but were before an idea revealed to Marx by the circumstances of his situation and the ideal and political atmosphere in which he lived. He put upon it scientific glass and enunciated it as an absolute law which admits of neither any particularization nor and exception.

There is no stronger testimony of this than that which is furnished by the contradiction of Marxist socialism in the trends which it displayed after the death of Marx, as we have pointed out shortly before, the East taking the revolutionary stamp, and the West the democratic revisionist stamp. This contradiction

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

expresses, in fact, a difference in the understanding of Marxism, to that extent which it expresses the limitation of the Marxist conception to a particular social situation, from this it may be concluded that revolutionary Marxism could not be one of the absolute historical realities but that it was discovered by Marx at a certain moment of time and that it is an interpretation of the milieu in which Marx lived and when that milieu underwent change in Western Europe, and revealed new things, the idea became meaningless notwithstanding its preservation in Eastern Europe with all its values, wherein these things had not occurred.

We do not mean to say by this that we believe that every (social) theory must necessarily arise from socio-political formations, our aim is (only) to lay down that:

Firstly: There are some ideas and theories which influence the objective circumstances of society and appear as if they are absolute truth while they are no such things but are only truths relative to those particular circumstances, some of Marx's conceptions of history are of this nature.

Secondly: All the conceptions—which come under the rule of historical materialism and correspond with Marxist theory of knowledge are necessarily relative truths subordinate to the socio-economic relations which exist therein, and follow them haphazardly in their evolution and development, and it will not be possible to take historical materialism in its shape as an absolute truth in respect of history as long as the theories are construed to have been the result of the relatively developing circumstances as Marxism itself has affirmed.

III-WHAT IS THE THEORY IN GENERAL

After having studied historical materialism in the light of the Marxist fundamental method of philosophical materialism, dialectics and the historical materialism itself or in other words, in the light of the methodology of historical materialism in respect of the interpretation of knowledge, and have specified its stand-point in respect of that method, after we have studied all this, the time has come to move on the second stage of our study of the historical materialism; and that is, that we may take up the study as to what that theory is in general which comprehends in terms of its interpretation the life of man and his social history in its entirety. We will study it here in this general nature of it irrespective of its details and without regard to characteristic features of each and every one of its phases.

When we take up the study of it in this form we will find in the presence of the inquiry a number of questions awaiting answer.

Firstly: What is the nature of the argument which may possibly be advanced to establish the idea which is basic to historical materialism, that it is the objective reality of the forces of production which is the chief force of history and the basic factor in the life of man?

Secondly: Does there exist a higher criterion by which to test and weigh scientific theories and what is the stand of that criterion in respect of the Marxist theory of history?

Thirdly: Has historical materialism been able to bring

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

under its hypohetrical interpretation of all the far and obscure, corners of the human history or have there been some parts which have remained outside its bounds?

Our inquiry will turn round the answers to these questions till when we have finished with that we will move on to the third stage of our study of historical materialism — the study of its details, and its subsequent stages.

FIRST: WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT ACCORDING TO THE HISTORICAL MATERIALISM?

To make possible for us the acquaintance of the knowledge of the styles of argument employed by Marxism to prove its conception of historical materialism, it is necessary to study comprehensively a bulky collection of books and ideas in respect of historical materialism inasmuch as these styles of argument are presented disconnectedly and distributedly in the totality of the Marxist books.

However it is possible for us to sum up the substance of the arguments on which historical materialism relies in three things:

- a) Philosophical argument.
- b) Psychological argument.
- c) Scientific argument.

A- The Philosophical Argument:

As for the philosophical argument- and we mean by it the argument which relies upon philosophical analysis of the problem and not upon experiments and observation derived from different epochs of history - it is this that the historical occurrences being subject to the law of causality compels us to ask as to the cause of the historical changes by which the successive historical occurrences, the different social ideological and political currents

could be explained. A casual glance at history will reveal to us that modern Europe, the present day European society differs in its social contents and its various kinds of appearances from the European societies as they were before ten centuries. It is necessary that there should be a cause for the occurrence of this general social difference and that we should explain every change in the social existence in terms, of its original source which works this existence and the change in it in the same way as the physicist studies in the field of physics, in the light of its sources and explains it in terms of its cause inasmuch as all the spheres of the cosmos, physical and human are subject to the law of causation. Well, then what is the cause of all those changes which make their appearance on the stage of history?

The answer made to this question would be that it is the ideology or opinion which holds sway, over the European society of the present day, and it differs from the European society of old days, in point of difference of social ideas and opinions ruling over each one of these societies.

But is it possible to stop before this explanation of history and society?

However, if we take a step forward in our analysis of history we will find ourselves compelled to ask as to whether our ideas and opinions are subject to mere chance? Naturally, the reply to this question in the light of the law of causation would be in the negative. For the ideas and opinions are subject to chance, nor, are they born with men and die when they die but they are only acquired by men and they occur and change and are subject to particular causes as to their coming into existence and their development. Therefore, they cannot then, be considered as the ultimate cause of the historical and social occurrences as long as they are in their turn contingent subject to specified laws, and it rather becomes necessary that we should search for the factors which are in bringing into existence the ideas and opinions

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

and causing their development. For example, why was it that the belief in the political liberty made its appearance in the present new age, while it did not exist in the Europe of middle ages, and that how was it that the views which clash with the view of private property have become so wide-spread at the present stage of history instead of the previous stage of history?

Here we should explain or rather it becomes necessary for us that we should explain, the birth of ideas and their development in terms of the social formations in a general way or in terms of some one of these formations like the economic formation, in a particular way. But that would not mean that we have any advancement in the solution of the philosophical problem, for by that we have done nothing more than explaining that the ideas and opinions have been formulated and developed in following the formulation and development of the social forms and thus we have come at the end to the very point from which we had set out – ended with the social formation whence from the beginning we had desired to start and discover the cause (of the change). Now if the opinions and ideas are born of the social formations, then what are those causes by which the social formations have come into existence? Or put in other words, the question is: What is the root cause of society and history?

Under this circumstance, we have before us only two ways of discovering the causes of social forms and giving of explanation how they came about.

The first way: We retrace a step backward and repeat the previous opinion, the opinion which believes in explaining the social formation with its different political and economic sub-structures etc. in terms of ideas and opinions; in that case we would be going round a vicious circle for we had said at first that ideas and opinions are born of the social formations, and now when we have returned and said that these social formation are

the result of the ideas and opinions and thus we have described vicious circle, and returned to whence we had started.

And it is this way which the idealists have followed in their interpretation of history. Plekhanov says:

Hegel found himself having fallen in the very same vicious circle, in which the (French) sociologists and French historians had fallen for they had explained social forms by the existing state of ideas, and the existing state of ideas by the social forms ... and the problem will continue to remain unsolved, till the science extricates it from the circularity of this vicious circle 'B' to be the cause of 'A' while at the same time specifying 'A' as the cause of 'B' (*The Philosophy of History*, (Arabic transl.) p.44)

And the other way –the Marxist way– It is this: To proceed in our inquiry in accordance with the law of causation to arrive at the explanation and the assignment of the cause and go beyond man's ideas and opinions, and the social relations in their various shapes and forms, go beyond them because all of them are of social phenomena, they come into existence at a certain period of time and develop, so they are in need of explanation and of the assignment of the cause of their occurrence. At this decisive moment in the sequel of our inquiry, there remains no course left open to us but to make a search for the secret of history outside the belt of all these phenomena and only the means of production are outside the belt of it, or in other words the physical nature with which man has been struggling with since the oldest of ages. It is these forces of production which alone can give answer to the question on the subject which we have been working upon as to for what reason and how historical events take place, and evolve in accordance with the philosophical necessity which holds that nothing occurs by chance and that for every occurrence there is a cause (Law of causality).

Thus it is not possible for the interpretation of history to

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

save itself from the vicious circle in the field of inquiry except if it places its hand on the means of production as the chief cause.

' This is what is called philosophical argument and it was our keen desire to present it in the best possible manner. (In this connection) we consider the book entitled *The Philosophy of History*, by Plekhanov, the great Marxian writer as the most important book inasmuch as it is directed, in all its discussions, to the reliance upon this sort of argumentation and the observations given above by us represent the gist of all his discussion.

Now that we have grasped fully well the philosophical argument for the theory, it becomes necessary to analyse it and to study it within the limits of philosophical necessity which holds that no events originate by chance (the law of causality).

Is this philosophical argument a sound argument? Is it true to say that the only explanation by which the philosophical problem of history is solved is the explanation given in terms of the means of production?

In order to pave the way for the answer to the question we take up one point, connected with the means of production which Marxism says is the true cause of history and this point is that the means are not inert static but in their turn they too change and develop with the passage of time in the same way as ideas and views of man as well as the forms of his society change with the passage of time. Hence one means of production dies and another means of production is born. So we may rightly ask about deeper cause which brings about the development of the means of production and keeps itself out of view behind the long course of its history just as we asked about the factors and causes which go towards making of ideas or the social forms.

And when we go to the Plekhanov, the man with the philosophical argument and others of his ilk from among the great Marxians, we do not expect them to admit the existence of a deeper cause of history behind the means of production for

that would contradict the basic ideology of historical materialism which holds that the means of production are the highest resort in the realm of history. It is for this reason that when they give reply to our question, try to explain the history of the productive forces, and their evolution, in terms of the productive forces themselves, saying that the productive forces are forces which change themselves, and the entire society changes following in its wake. But how is this accomplished and which is the road which the forces of production pursue to bring about change in them-selves? The Marxist answer to this question is also ready for it explains it in this way. The productive forces, in the course of man's grappling with nature give birth and steadily augment in the mind of man reflective ideas and knowledge¹ for the reflective ideas and scientific knowledge result from experience gained and experiment made by man during the course of his grappling with the forces of

-
1. Thoughts are divided in two classes, one of which consists of reflective or positive and we mean by it the information of man about nature in which he lives and whatever the kind of existence which adorn it and whatever of the laws under which it is run, such as our knowledge about the spherical nature of the earth or the domestication of the animal or the mode of transforming heat to motion and matter to energy or the know-ledge that every event is subject to a cause and all other such notions and ideas, as revolve round the determination of the nature of the universe and the kind of laws which governing ideas and notions of man. Such as, what behoves man or it.

And the other class consists of man's practical ideas that is how should an individual or society behave, in the sphere of economical, political and personal matters like the views of the capitalist society as to the relations which should be set up between the labourer and the owner of the property and the views of the socialist society which rejects these views or the views of this society or that as to how should husband and wife behave towards each other? Or what political course a government should follow.

Reflective (positive) ideas are about what is or what actually exists; and practical ideas are as to what ought to be or not to be.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the productive nature. and when man acquires these ideas and knowledge by way of his grappling with the productive forces of nature, these reflective ideas and scientific knowledge, become the forces with the help of which man is led to make invention of the means of production and the renovation of the forces of production and their continuous development.

This means the history of the development of productive forces is accomplished in correspondence with the reflective and scientific development and are fashioned by them and the reflective and scientific development in their turn are fashioned by these productive forces during the course of their experimentation. In this way, Marxism was able to assure the means of production, their chief position in the assure of history and to explain their development by way of added reflective ideas and increased scientific knowledge which are formed and fashioned by the productive forces, without admitting of any higher force instead of the means of production.

Engels has stressed the possibility of this kind of explanation, the explanation of the development of each one of the productive forces and the reflective ideas by the others, mentioning that dialectic does not hold out picture by the cause and effect as two opposite poles strongly opposed to each other as the non-dialecticians are accustomed to do, understanding them to be such and always hold that the cause is here and the effect is there. The dialecticians on the contrary take the cause and effect to be mutually interacting, that is, they both act and react upon each other.

This is the point which we have expounded for the analysis and criticism of the philosophical argument by way of introduction so that we may say, if doing such a thing is possible from philosophical side and that it is allowable for the interpretation to follow a circular course, as the Marxism has done in concerning the productive forces and their development, then why is not philosophically possible for us to do so in the same style,

concerning the explanation of social formation, and lay it down that the social formation is — in fact, represents the social experiment man had entered into during the course of his connections with other individuals, in the same way as he had entered into his experiment of nature, with productive forces, during the course of his productive operations and just as man's practical ideas increase and are perfected under the shelter of the experiment with nature and then after that in its turn influences the development of experiment and the invention of the new means of production, so in the same way the society's practical ideas may be augmented and develop under the shelter of social experiment and in its turn influence its development and its renovation.

The mind of the man of science about nature continues to grow during the course of his experiment with nature and the natural experiment and productive forces themselves are augmented on account of it. And in the same way the practical man's mind as to the social relation, continues to grow during the course of his social experience, and the prevalent social relations themselves develop by virtue of it.

On this basis there is nothing which prevents Marxism from explaining social formation by way of practical views and then after that explaining the changing the views and their development by way of social experience, as exemplified in the political and economical formations etc. ... inasmuch as this alternative explanation resembles completely the Marxist explanation in every way that is each historical phase of the force of production and that of the scientific mind resemble the other phase point by point.

And after these, stands the question why is it necessary that the productive forces should be taken into account in the interpretation of history and society and why is it necessary that we may not consider either of the alternative explanation of the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

social formation and ideas as sufficient for the other?

The philosophical necessity and the conception of cause and effect on which Engels has laid stress permit us to give an explanation like this and if there exist reasons which prevent us from adopting it, it is the historical experiences and observations. We will deal with it when we shortly hereafter take up the discussion of the scientific argument.

B— The Psychological Argument:

The starting point for this argument is to seek by reasoning that the rise of thought in the life of mankind results from the phenomena and forms of a specific society and to deduce from this that in the social being, its historical existence precedes the existence of thought, is not possible to explain social phenomena in their first formation and composition by ideal factors such as thoughts of man as long as these thoughts did not appear in history except in the form of later occurrences of specific social phenomena in the life of mankind. After this then, there is only one scientific trend for the explanation of society and for the assignation of the cause of its birth, the materialist trend, which casts aside the ideal factors and explains society by material factors in terms of the means of production.

The main point in this argument, then, is to establish by proof that thoughts did not occur in the realm of humanity except as the product of a prior social phenomenon so that it may be deduced there from that society is prior to thought and comes into existence from material factor and not by ideas and views.

But how has Marxism treated this main point and by what proofs it has established its truth? This becomes evident from Marxist emphasis on the fact that thoughts are given birth to by language and language is nothing but a social phenomenon. Stalin

Says:

It is said that ideas come to the mind of man before they expressed themselves in talk and that they are begotten without the media of language, that is without the frame work of language or in other words they are supply barn. But this is altogether a mistake. Whatever the thoughts be that come to the mind it is not possible for them to be begotten and to come into existence except on the basis of the media of language, that is, on the basis of linguistic words and sentences and there exist no thoughts devoid of words or free from the media of language or free from their natural material sheath which is language, for language is the direct reality of idea so it is not possible to talk of an idea without language for anyone except the idealist.¹

Thus Stalin correlated words with thoughts hence it is not possible to talk of thought apart from the media of language.

After that came the great Marxist writer George Politzer, to establish by proof this assumed fact in the light of psychological discoveries or what is more proper in the light of the physiological basis of psychology which the notable scholar, Pavlov had laid down deduced from a number of experiments made by him.

Politzer writes in the marginal note on the above quoted words of Stalin:

This (first) principle of dialectical materialism has received a strikingly brilliant support from the natural sciences by virtue of the physiological experiments made by the great scientist Pavlov. He (Pavlov) discovered that the basic processes in the activity of the brain are those of the conditioned reflex

1, Politzer. Georges: *Materialism and Idealism in Philosophy* (Arabic transl.) p.77. We wish to point out in this connection that this book is not the work of G. Politzer but of the two Marxist writers, G. Mess and Morris Kanfeg. But as they have given his name as the author of the book we too have done so.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

which are formed in specific circumstances, and which are set up by sensations whether these be external or internal. In this way, Pavlov established that sensations play the role of directed signals in respect of every activity of a living organic being. On another side he discovered that it was possible for words with their contents and meanings to take place of the sensation which are evoked by things, which are indicative of them. In this way, words are made of signals, — that is a second system of the process of signalling formed on the basis of the first system and it is peculiar to man and is considered language which is a condition of man's higher activity, the foundation of his social activity and is the ground of his abstract thought which transcends the timely feeling, the basis of his intellectual insight for it is these which enable man to reflect reality to a greater degree of precision. It was in this way that Pavlov proved that what determines — basically — man's consciousness is not his physiological apparatus and his biological milieu but on the contrary it is rather in accordance with the reflexion of the society in which he lives that determines it. (*ibid.*, p.78)

Let us take something from this elucidatory attempt of Politzer in which he seeks to discuss Marxist view from Pavlov's investigations.

Politzer observes that according to the view of Pavlov, in respect of the basic processes of the brain that, all these are responses to definite stimuli or signals. These stimuli in their first phase are sensations. It is obvious that these responses which are evoked by sensations and signals cannot be pure ideas, ideas apart from the things for these do not occur except in the presence of sensations evoked by things, for they do not enable man to think about a thing which is absent from him. In the second phase comes the role of language and the verbal media in order to play the

role of the stimuli and secondary signals. They condition every word with a certain definite sensation from among the sensations. It becomes a conditional stimulus in the second phase and enables man to think by way of responses which the linguistic stimuli send out to his mind so it is, then, the language which is the basis of thought and since language is nothing but a social phenomenon, so the thought, according to this, is nothing but a secondary phenomenon of man's social life.

It is the thought which Politzer has offered.

We, however, in our turn may ask the question; Is it, in fact, language which is the basis of thought (for there exists no thought apart, free from the media of language) according to Stalin's interpretation? For the sake of clarity let us pose the question in the following manner. Is it language which created out of man a thinking being as a specific social phenomenon as Politzer avers? Or that the language arose in the life of the thoughts wanting means to express and present themselves to others. We cannot seize with the first hypothesis which Politzer has sought to lay emphasis upon, till the time we are made free from the discussion of the experiments of Pavlov and the principle which he has formulated about the natural and conditional stimuli.

* * * * *

In order for us to make it more plain, it is necessary to give extended thought to the views of Pavlov and to his method of interpreting thought in physiological terms inasmuch as this notable scientist was able to indicate that when a specific thing is correlated with its natural stimulus it acquires the same active power which the natural stimulus possesses, begins to play the same role and evokes the same response which the natural stimulus evokes, for example, offering of food to a dog is the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

natural stimulus. It evokes a definite response from the dog in that at the first sight of the vessel which contains food for him, saliva begins to flow from his mouth. Pavlov observed this, and he took to ringing the bell at the time food was offered to him. He repeated this several times, then he took to ringing bell without offering the food and found that the saliva of the dog used to flow (whenever the bell was rung) he deduced from this experiment that it was the ringing of the bell which had evoked the very response which the natural stimulus had evoked and had discharged its very role on account of its association with and being conditioned by it, at several times, so he applied to the ringing of the bell, the name conditional stimulus – and the name to watering of the mouth and the secretion of the saliva, which was evoked by the ringing of the bell, conditioned response.

It was on this basis that a party tried to explain every thought of man into physiological terms fully in the same way as the secretion of the saliva in the case of the dog, inasmuch as all the thoughts of man are responses to different kinds of stimuli. And just as the presentation of the food, the natural stimulus, evokes the natural response, which is the secretion of the saliva, so in the same way there exist in man natural stimulus which liberate specific responses, which we consider as some sense-perception and those stimuli which liberate these responses, are external as well as internal sensations and just as the ringing of the bell which causes that very response to occur which the presentation of the food evokes in the dog, by association with and being conditioned by it, so in the same way there are found many things associated with those natural stimuli in the case of man and become conditioned stimuli in place of them. All of the media of language, are some of them the word 'water' liberates the very response which the sensation connected with water liberates on account of its being associated with and conditioned to it for the sensation connected with water or tangible water is

a natural stimulus and the word 'water' is a conditioned stimulus and both of them evoke in the mind a characterist kind of response.

So on account of this Pavlov framed the hypothesis of two signalling systems: The first of these signal systems consists of all the natural stimuli and conditioned responses in which words have no place.

And the second of these signalling systems consists of words and the media of language as secondary conditioned stimuli, having been conditioned by the stimuli of the first signalling system and on account of it having acquired the power of effecting the definite responses.

And the result to which the views of Pavlov lead are these: that it is not possible for man to think without a stimulus inasmuch as thought is nothing but a kind of specific response to the stimuli. Likewise, it is not possible for man to have an abstract mental thought except when it comes into existence related to the conditioned stimuli acquired, by way of its being associated with sensations, the very responses which those sensations have liberated and that since he is dependent upon his sensations, he cannot have absolute thoughts, that is he cannot think about a thing which is intangible to his sense. Therefore, to make man a thinking being, it is necessary that there be existing for him stimuli behind the bound of sensation, behind the bound of natural stimuli.

* * * * *

Let us take for granted that all this is correct, but does that mean that language is the basis for the existence of thought? Certainly not; for the conditioning of a specific thing to a natural stimulus in order that it becomes a conditioned stimulus, results sometimes in a natural way, just as when the sight of water

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

happens coincidently to be accompanied by certain definite sound or a specific mental state at several times or on several occasions, till it becomes for that sound or that mental state, a conditioned stimulus which evokes the very response which the sensation which water evokes. That conditioning in these circumstances as a natural conditioning. This conditioning another time takes place as a result of a definite design just as our way with a child. When we give something, say milk, and repeat its name, till a bond is formed between the thing and the word. It becomes a conditioned stimulus for the child as a result of the method we followed with him.

There is no doubt that several of the sounds and events are associated with natural stimulus in the course of the life of man and are conditioned, naturally by them. They come thereby to evoke the responses in the mind. As for the media of language in a general way its words, the conditioning of which was completed during the socializing process, these were conditioned as a result of man's need to express his thoughts and convey them to others, that is to say they came into the life of man because he was a thinking being wanting to give expression to his thoughts and not because language came in his life he became a thinking being, for, if such were the case why was it that language did not come into the life of other animal species? Language is not the basis of thought, it is only a specific mode of giving expression to thoughts adopted by man since remotest times, when he felt in the course of the struggle he was engaged along with other human individuals with nature that, the pressing need for expressing his thoughts to others and for understanding the thoughts of others as a means to facilitate the operations which they were carrying on and to determine their collective stand before nature and against the antagonistic forces.

It was only the man learnt to adopt this mode, the mode of language — itself to give expression to his thoughts during the

jointly collective work in the light of what was completed by nature or accidentally, as to the conditioning of some of the sounds with some of natural stimuli by way of their oft repeated association with them. Man however was able to avail of it in a wider scope and thus was able to bring it into his life.

Thus we know that language as a social phenomena, arose in the life of man only as a result of his feeling the need in the course of jointly collective work for the translation of his thoughts and for the declaration of it to others, and that it was not language which by coming into his life made him a thinking being.

On this basis, we are able to know why was it that language appeared in the life of man and did not appear in the life of other species of animals as hinted to by us earlier? Or rather we have come to know more than this to why was it that there existed associative life in human society while there did not exist such an associative life of any other living being? It was because man was able to think, reflect, so it was possible for him and for him only to transcend the limits of perception and to change the existing reality which he perceives, and subsequently to change and alter the perceptions themselves, in correspondence with the tangible reality. This was not possible for any other animal not possessing the power of thinking to do so, for it is not able to understand anything or think about anything except the tangible reality in their specific shapes, so it is not possible for it to alter existing reality to some other thing.

Thus it is thought which reserves for man with the power to change the tangible reality in a possible manner.

And since the changing operation of the existing reality demands on several occasions a numerous and various sort of endeavours so the effecting of it takes the collective stamp, a number of individuals having joined in it according to the nature of it and according to the extent of efforts required for effecting

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

it. Thus social relation was found to exist among them. It is not possible to find the existence of relations of this nature between individuals of other species of animals inasmuch as other animal species are not thinking beings, they are unable to carry on operations to bring about positive changes in the tangible reality so consequently there does not come into existence social relations of this nature.

From the time that man entered into joint actions, for bringing about change in the tangible reality, they felt the need of language for the signals of sense - perceptions, whilst they give expression to the tangible reality are unable to give expression to a thought to bring about its change or the specific relations which exist between the perceived things which man wants to change or to modify language comes to existence in the life of man to satisfy and fulfil this need of his. It came into only his life because animals did not feel a need like that of man, a need which was born of collective activity founded on the basis of the thinking power for the changing the tangible reality and for effecting positive modification therein.

C- The Scientific Argument:

The scientific explanation of the changing universe proceeds in a progressive line. It begins as a hypothetical explanation of reality which a scientist is treating and the sources and causes of which he is trying to discover. The hypothetical explanation attains to the scientific degree only when the scientific evidence is able to establish it as the only possible explanation of the phenomenon, the subject matter of the investigation and to deny the possibility of any other explanation save it. Any hypothetical explanation which is not established in this way cannot attain to the scientific degree of certainty or scientific reliability and there will be no justification for its acceptance save as one like other explanations. For example, we find a certain person habitually crossing

a certain street at a certain time of the day. We may advance the assumption, by way of explanation of this habitual behaviour of the person that he pursues this very road because of the fact that he is a daily worker in the factory which lies at the end of the street. This assumption will be a fit explanation of the occurrence but it will not mean that it is an acceptable explanation as long as it is possible for us to explain this behaviour of the person in another light, such as, we may assume that he is going directly that way to visit a friend who lives in a house in that street or is repeating his call on or a physician who has his clinic in that quarter to consult about the state of his health or is doing it with the intention of attending lectures regularly delivered at a certain academy.

Such is the case with Marxist explanation of history (historical materialism), we cannot take it to be an adequate explanation of history by obtaining scientific evidence which repudiates all other hypothesis, emerges from being a hypothesis and attains to the degree of becoming a scientific theory or to the degree of scientific certainty and reliability.

Let us take, by way of illustration, the explanation of historical materialism in respect of the state. It explains the phenomenon of the relic state and its existence in the life of man on the basis of the economic factors and class-contradiction. In a class-contradictory society there rages a war between the strong class which owns the means of production and the weak class which owns nothing. The dominant class creates the political organ to defend its interest and to secure its leading position. That political organ is the state in its various historical shapes and forms.

This Marxist explanation of the state or government cannot acquire sure scientific value except when it can render bankrupt all other explanations by which it is possible to demonstrate the rise of the state in human society otherwise than as a political organ of class exploitation. But if we are able to explain this

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

social phenomenon on other basis, and the scientific proof does not reject or repudiate that explanation, then in that case, the Marxist explanation cannot be deemed to be anything more than a hypothesis.

So Marxist's explanation will not be deemed a scientific explanation if, for example, it is possible for us to explain the rise of state on the basis of the complication of civilized life and demonstrate the establishment of the state in a number of human societies in this way. For example, social life would not have been possible in the ancient Egypt, without a great deal of complicated assertions and extensive general work undertaken to organize the system of canalising of the rivers, and the irrigation. The state in that society arose in order to facilitate social life and to supervise the complicated operations upon the well-doing of which the life of the common people depended. It is on account of this that we find the Egyptian tribe of Ecclerius, enjoying the highest position in the administration of the state affairs not on the basis of class interest but on the basis of the momentous role they played in the Egyptian agricultural system on account of their expert knowledge. Similarly we find the people of the church enjoying the highest position in the Roman administrative machinery at the time when the Germanic people entered the Roman Kingdom as invading barbarians, hordes after hordes. The church appeared as the prominent source of thought in the country upon the heel of the destruction caused to culture and learning by the Germanic raids, whence, the man from among the church people was the only one when knew the art of reading and writing and speaking the Latin language and the only one who understood keeping account of the months, and was able to look after managing in the difficult task of administering the affairs of the state whilst the German kings, and the leaders of the armed people spent their time in hunting boars, deers and camels ibese and in carrying on wars and raids of destruction. It was,

therefore, but natural for them to build great influence in the governing political apparatus of the State which gained them great spoils and profits — which made them according to Marxism a specific class of vested interest. Although their economic influence and their economic advantage came to them by way of their political existence in the administrative machinery of the government, they did not owe to this economic influence which they acquired after this, they owed it to their distinctive ideological and administrative ability.

Marxist explanation of the state will not be deemed scientific if it were possible to assume that religious creed has been influential in the forming of many of the states and political powers which are supported on the basis of religion, represented by societies not having common class interest but by societies bearing the religious stamp of common denominator.

In the same way, it is possible for us to assume that the creation of the state in human society was for the satisfaction of the political instinct deep rooted in the soul of man which possesses the power hidden therein inclining man to dominate and hold power over others and that the state was the inspired urge of it, its practical realization.

I do not want to explore all the possible assumptions as the basis for the explanation of the state ... my only object behind this is to say that the Marxist explanation of the state cannot be deemed a scientific theory, till it is able to repudiate all of these assumptions and to advance the argument from actual facts to prove their spuriousness.

We have given the Marxist explanation as to how the state came into existence, by way of a simple of all of its other conceptions and assumptions on the basis of which it explains the human society inasmuch as these assumptions to become good for acceptance as scientific theory, demand of Marxism to bring argument to prove the falsity of all the other assumption save its

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

own for it is not sufficient for its acceptance as a scientific theory that it is one of the possible assumptions which holds good for the application to end the explanation of the reality.

So let us see how is it possible for Marxism to present an argument of this nature in this connection? The first and the serious obstacle which confronts Marxism in its path in this connection is the nature of the subject matter of history. It is this, the subject matter of inquiry in the field of history (the origin and development of the society and the basic operative factors therein) differ in nature from the subject matters of scientific inquiry in the field of physical sciences, which for example he selects from his information based on scientific experiments.

The investigator of history and the physicist, if they meet at one point, it is in the matter of taking in hand all the phenomena in their totality — the phenomena of human society such as the state, ideas or property, or the physical phenomena such as, the heat, sound and light, — as matters or data of inquiry they try to arrange these — phenomena in an orderly manner as a material for investigation and for discovering their causes. But they differ from each other in regard of their scientific approach to these phenomena — the subject matter of their study. This difference arises from two sources. The historical investigator who proposes to explain human society its origin, its developments and its stages, is not able to investigate these phenomena directly, in the way a physicist is able to explain physical phenomena which he can test by special experiments. The historical investigator is compelled to resort to form an idea about them based on hearsay tales, reports of authorities and traces of various sociological creatures and such other relies — which are in themselves defective evidences. And this difference constitutes, indeed, a great difference between the physical phenomena as the main materials for investigation on which the scientific inquiry is based

and the historical phenomena as the primary material for investigation on which the historical inquiry is created. The physical phenomena which the physicist subjects to study are phenomena which occur during the life time of the physicist — are contemporaneous in time with him, present in the experiment. He is able to observe them himself and to subject them to the scientific light and so is able subsequently to expound them fully ... but quite contrary is the case with the material which an investigator of history handles for when he tries to discover the main factors which operate in the society and to find how they arose and developed, he is obliged to rely, in the formulation of the material of investigation, for the deduction and explanation upon many of the historical phenomena of the society, the personal observation of which is not possible for him and the knowledge of which he comes by through reports and narrations of authorities, hearsay from travellers, and the remains of historical relies. We may mention by way of example, in this connection that when Engels tried in his book the *Origin of Family* as a historical investigator to explain social phenomena scientifically, he was obliged to rely in general, for his deductions, upon the reports and assumptions of a certain historian or traveller and that historian was Morgan.

It is in this way that the historical inquiry differs from physical inquiry from the point of materials (phenomena) which the inquirer possesses, and upon which he bases, his explanation and his deductions. But the difference does not stop at this point, for just as those differ from the point of view of material, so also there exists another source of their difference in point of proof or argument which it is possible for an inquirer to employ in support of this i.e. this scientific explanation or that scientific explanation.

It is this when an investigator of history obtains the totality of the historical phenomena and historical occurrences, he does not possess before him the direction of those possibilities which

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the investigator of the physical phenomena does, for example, the direction of possibilities which are before him in respect of the atom its nucleus, its electrical charges, its rays, for that reason the historical investigator is obliged to take perforce, the historical phenomena and historical occurrences just as they are, and it is not possible for him to change or vary anything there-from. As for the physicist he can subject to various experiments the material which he is handling, remove from it or add to it anything in any way he likes. He can do so even in spheres in which the subject studied does not permit any change or alteration in its material like the subject of astronomy, there too it is possible for the astronomer to vary his relation in respect of that material or his position or his direction by the help of a telescope.

The inability of the investigator of history from making experiments upon the historical and social phenomena, would mean his inability to advance empirical argument in respect of his theories by which he explains history and discloses its secrets.

The investigator of history is not able, when he tries, for example, to discover the basic factors of a particular historical phenomena, to make use of the scientific method which the empirical logic has laid down, and which the physicist makes use of, such as the two methods – the two main methods of empirical reasoning. These two methods agree in the addition of a certain factor, in its entirety or the removal of a certain factor in its entirety in order to see how far and to what extent it is correlated with some other factors. So as to establish scientifically that 'b' in the cause of 'a' they are combined together under various circumstances and this is what is called the method of agreement. Then 'b' is separated from 'a' to see if 'a' disappears when 'b' is separated from it and this is what is called the method of disagreement obviously the historical investigator has no power to do anything of this sort, he cannot change the historical reality of humanity.

Let us take, by way of an illustration of this, the state as a manifestation of the historical phenomena and heat as a manifestation of the physical phenomena when the physicist will seek scientific explanation of heat and to disclose its main source or cause, it will be possible for him, to assume that motion is the cause of it when he perceives them to be found together under various circumstances and conditions. He, then, will make use of the method of agreement in order to make sure of the soundness of his assumption. He will then institute a number of experiments in each one of which he will try to remove one of the things found together with heat and motion to make sure as to whether heat is found or not, without it and that the thing removed is not the cause of it. He will also make use of the method of disagreement by instituting an experiment in which he will separate heat from motion to make it explicit as to whether it is possible to find heat without motion. And if the experiment reveals that heat is found wherever motion is found whatever the other circumstances or occurrences be and it disappears under circumstances and conditions in which motion is absent .. . (and thus) establishes scientifically that motion is the cause of heat.

As for the investigator of history when he takes up in hand the state as a manifestation of the historical phenomenon, he may assume that it is the outcome of the economic interest of a certain section of the society but he will not be able to eliminate other assumptions experimentally, for it will not for instance, be possible for him to demonstrate experimentally that the state is not the outcome of political instinct inherent in the mind of man, or the outcome of a specific complexity in the civil or social life.

The utmost which historical investigator can do is to put his hand on a number of historical conditions under which the appearance of state will be found yoked with a specific economic

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

interest and to collect a number of instances in which the state and the economic interest are found together (and this is what is termed, in the empirical or scientific logic as the statistical method).

Obviously, this statistical method cannot scientifically demonstrate that the class of economic interest is the sole basic cause for the appearance of the state when it is valid to assume that other factors too may have special influence in the formulation of the state and whereas, a historical investigator is unable to bring about a change in a historical reality as a physicist is able to vary the physical phenomena by experiment, so he will not be able to remove all the other factors from the social reality to see the result of this removal to ascertain whether the state, as a manifestation of the social phenomena will or will not disappear with the removal of all these factors.

The sum and the substance of what has been said above is that the historical investigation differs in nature from the physical investigation from the material on the basis of which are set up the deductions in the first place and in the second place in point of evidence and arguments which go to strengthen and lend further support to those deductions.

On this basis we come to know that when Marxism formulated its particular conception of history it did not possess the support of scientific authority save this observation which it thought sufficient for its particular point of view in respect of history and it did more than this it assumed that this limited observation of the narrow field of history was quite sufficient for discovering all the laws of history in their entirety and for the certain conviction thereof. For Engels has said:

But while in all the earlier periods the investigation of these driving causes of history was almost impossible — on account of the complicated and concealed inter-connections between them and their effects — on present period has so far

simplified these inter-connections that the riddle could be solved. Since the establishment of the large-scale industry, that is, at least since the European peace of 1915, it has no longer been a secret to any man in England that the whole political struggle there turned on the claims to supremacy of two classes: the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie (middle class). (Engels: *Ludwig Feuerbach*, p.95).

This means that the observation of the social formation at a particular interval in the life of Europe or of England was sufficient, in the opinion of the great Marxist, thinker, Engels to convince scientifically that the economic factor and the class-contradiction, is the main factor in the entire history of mankind in spite of the fact that the other intervals of history do not reveal this because these intervals are clouded in tangled complications, as Engel himself avers so; it is that a single field of observation from among the other fields of the history of 18th or 19th century was able to convince Marxism that the forces of economics were the driving forces of history during all these centuries, – they were convinced of this by nothing except that it appeared that it was this factor alone which was the ruling power in that particular observed field of history, the field of England at that limited interval of its history in despite of the fact that a particular factor ruling over a society at a particular interval of its history cannot be held to be sufficient for the argument as to its being the main factor ruling over all the epochs of history and for all the societies inasmuch as it may be that this ruling power itself may have its own particular causes and factors so to pass judgement in respect of history it is necessary to compare the society in which the economic factor appears to be the ruling factor with other societies, so as to ascertain if this domination has its own particular conditions and causes.

It behoves us in this connection to take into consideration another quotation from Engels given in another context apologizing for the fault he had fallen in for his boldness as to the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

application of the dialectics to the non-social from the sphere of the nature and life, saying:

It goes without saying that my recapitulation of mathematics and the natural sciences, was undertaken in order to convince myself also in detail — of what in general, I was not in doubt — that in nature of innumerable changes, the same dialectical laws of motion force their way through as which in history, apparent events of history. (*Anti-Dühring*, [Arabic transl.], vol.2, p.193)

If we compare this quotation with his previous quotation, we will be able to come to know, how it was possible for a Marxist thinker like Engels to formulate his general conception vis-à-vis history and subsequently his philosophical conception vis-à-vis nature and life as well as all of their manifestations in the light of a particular single historical field of observation of a particular human society chosen from other societies at a limited interval of time in a facile manner. And as long as this particular field of observation reveals the fight between two classes, it is inevitable that history be all a fight between contradictions and that if it was contradiction which rules over history. This fact was sufficient to convince Engels that these very laws of this contradiction according to his version, force their way through nature and that nature is all a fight between various internal contradictions.

SECOND: DOES THERE EXIST A HIGHER CRITERION?

According to Marxism the extent of the success of a theory in the field of practices is the highest Criterion for testing its soundness for in the opinion of the Marxist it is not possible to separate theory from practice and this is what is termed in dialectics unity of theory and practice. Mao Tse Tung writes:

The theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism puts

practice in the first place. It holds that for man's acquisition of knowledge it is necessary that it is not cut off from practice in the slightest degree, and assails contentedly any erroneous theory which denies the importance of practice or allows the separation of knowledge from practice. (About practice, p.4)

George Pulitzer writes:

Then it is important that we should grasp the meaning of the unity of theory and practice, and the meaning is this: He who neglects theory falls victim to the philosophy of pragmatism and walks like one blind and gropes in darkness. As for that man who neglects practice, he falls into the pit of religious inertness. (*Materialism and Idealism in Philosophy* [Arabic transl.], p.114)

It is on the basis of this that we propose to study historical materialism or in other words, general Marxist theory of history, in order to know the lot of its success in the field of the revolutionary practice Marxists have engaged themselves in.

It is obvious that for Marxists it was possible to try the application of the theory to practice, only to that particular part of the theory which relates to the development of the capitalist society into socialist society. As for the other parts of the theory, they are connected with the laws of the historical societies that came into existence in the life of man and have passed away. Marxism was neither contemporaneous with them nor he had any share in bringing them into existence.

Let us, therefore, take that particular portion of the theory which relates to the development of the capitalist society and the birth of the socialist society, and which is the Marxist attempt at correspondence of theory to practice, in order to ascertain and clarify the extent of the unity of theory and practice or their contradiction and subsequently to give our judgement in respect of the theory in accordance with the extent of its success or

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

failure, inasmuch as the correspondence of the theory with practice is, according to Marxism, the basic standard for the establishment of theories and the essential element of a sound theory.

In this connection we find it possible for us to divide the socialist countries which effected the practice of Marxist theory wholly or partially, into two groups (contrary to) practice in either of these countries came far removed from the theory, as well as the scientific predictions and whatever of the laws it has determined as to the course of history and the social currents.

The first of these two groups consist of co-socialist countries in which the socialist order was imposed upon by red military force like the countries in the eastern zone of Europe such as Bolonia, Czechoslovakia and Magyar. In these countries and their likes, transformation to socialism was neither effected as one of the which the necessities of the rule which the theory has determined nor did the revolution emanate from the inner social contradictions but was imposed upon from outside and from above through foreign war and armed military invasion. If that were not so then which of the laws of history it was which cut Germany into two halves, and annexed its eastern part into the socialist world and its other part into the capitalist world? Was it the law of the forces of production or was it the authority of the victorious army which imposed its system and its ideology upon the territory which it had brought under its rule?

As for the second of these two groups of socialist countries, in these countries socialistic orders have been established by internal revolutions. But these internal revolutions were not the embodiment of the Marxist laws nor did they occur in conformity with the theory by which Marxists have solved all the riddles of history. Russia, and it is the first country in the world in which socialist regime became dominant by the action of internal revolution — was one of the industrially backward countries of Europe and the productive forces therein had not reached that stage which the theory

determines for the change to and the sprawl of socialist revolution. It was not the increase of the productive forces, which played the major role in determining the shape of the order and the formation of the essence of the society in accordance with the theory, but played a reverse role. Whereas productive forces in countries like France, Britain and Germany had grown up tremendously and these countries had entered the highest stage of industrialization. Yet with that degree of their advancement in this field they were far from the revolution, and they were delivered from the bursting of an inevitable communist revolution according to the conceptions of historical materialism.

As for Russia, industrialization movement therein was very low. The local capitalist were quite unable to solve the problem of quick industrialization under the prevailing political and social conditions, and there was place for comparison between the industrial capitalism of those backward countries and the industrial forces as well as the massive industrial capital of the countries of western Europe. Yet it was in these countries that the revolutionary trends took root and burst up with a sudden spring, and the industrial revolution came as a result of the political revolution. Hence it was the revolutionary apparatus of the state, which was the powerful instrument in the industrialization of the country and the development of the country's productive forces. It was not the industrialization and the development of the countries productive forces which were the cause of the creation of that apparatus and bringing into existence of those instruments.

Now if it is necessary that we establish a nexus between the revolution from one side and the industrialization and productive forces from the other side then it is quite reasonable that we reverse the Marxist assumption as to the relation between the revolution and the industrialization and consider that the lowness of industrial and productive level are some

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

assumption of the important factors which lead to the ringing of bells of revolution like Russia in a way quite contrary to the Marxist that the socialist revolution, according to the laws of historical material-ism, cannot take place except as a result of the growth of industrial capitalism, and its reaching the apex. Russia, for example, was impelled to revolution by the growth of the forces of production as to the extent it was driven by the fear on account of the lowness of those productive forces and its industrial backwardness to remain in the rearguard of the procession of the countries which had made fascinating advancement by striding leaps in the field of industry and (industrial) productiveness, so there was no alternative for Russia to make secure her real position in the family of the world's community of nations but to create that political and social apparatus which would enable her to solve quickly her problem of industrialization and by it to push ahead in the preparation of the race for industrialization and in the field of formidable competition between states and that without creating the apparatus which was capable of solving these problems Russia would fall a victim to the monopolization which the competing states had started and her existence as an independent state would come to end.

Thus, if we looked at Russia from the angle of the productive forces, as Marxists always do and its industrial state, we shall find the main problem which it was faced with was the problem of the bringing into existence of industrialization and not the contradiction arising from growth of industrialization with the political and economic entities of the society.

The socialist revolution secured the government, and was able, by the nature of its political entity (founded on absolute and limitless authority) and by the nature of its economic entity (founded on the concentration of all productive activities and operation in one hand, (that is, the state) to move on with mighty strides to the industrialization of the country. Hence it

was the socialist regime which created the reasons of its existence and Marxist justifications of its creation and there grew up the class which claims that it represents it and has transformed the productive forces in the country to a stage which Marx considers as defact socialism.

After this we may rightfully ask as to whether there would have been set up a government bearing the political and economic imprint of socialism, were it not that Russia lagged industrially, politically, ideologically behind as to the level of the great industrial countries?

And China, and this is another country wherein the socialist rule became dominant by way of revolution. Here too we find, as we did in the case of Russia obvious conflict between theory and practice. Here, too, neither the industrial revolution has been the main factor in the formulation of the new China and the change of its system of government, nor the means of production, or the surplus value, and the contradictions of capital, as laid down by the laws of historical materialism have played in whatsoever way the chief part in the political battle field.

And the last thing it behoves us to take into consideration is the fact that the internal revolutions which practically effected the introducing of Marxist socialism, did not depend for their victory upon class-struggle and the collapse of the ruling-class before the dominated one on account of the intensity of the class-conflict between them, to that extent to which they depended upon the military collapse of the ruling apparatus under severe war condition, like the collapse of the Tsarist rule in Russia militarily on account of the fighting conditions of the first world war - a fact which made political victory possible for the opposing forces - and on their head was the communist party - to achieve political victory, by way of revolution resulting in the rein of government coming into the possession of the communist party, the perfectly well-built organizationally and numerically and the strongest

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

unity from the point of ideological leadership. Similar was the case with the communist revolution in China. Though it began before Japan's invasion of China, it continued for full one decade disseminating and spreading to emerge finally victorious at the end of the war. Hence practice (correspondence of theory with practice) has not been able up to this day, to have confirmed the coming of victory by way of internal conflict, or to have demolished the governing machinery by war and external condition causing it to collapse down.

The features and the characteristic signs of the theory did not appear from the practice of it. All that appeared from its practice was this, a society in which revolution has taken place, has upturned its (social) order blown away violently its governing machinery after which the machinery had cracked down and split up by the war and by the external conditions and the urgency of the keen consciousness of the people's need for a new kind of political and social life.

The very factors which made revolution successful in Russia or caused it to be disposed towards were present, partially or wholly in several other countries, had been witness to the self-same war condition Russia was witnessing had turned up in the wake of the first world war similar revolutions in which, the crack of -governing machine, acute sense of their insufficiency, and the feeling of the increasing need for quick advancement, so as to joining up with the world procession going ahead, had played a momentous role, except that the only revolution which took up the socialist imprint was the Russian revolution. However it is not possible for us to find the reason of it in the difference of productive forces. These were similar to a certain extent in those countries. We find difference only in the ideological conditions which were passing over those countries and currents and cross-currents which were active in the political field and revolutionary sphere here and there.

Then if whatever the dialectic logic of Marxism assumes as to the unity of theory and practice and if practice is the sole basis of the support of the theory, then this too is equally true, that historical materialism even to this day has been missing the point that the practice (of socialism) which Marxism realised neither bears the characteristic marks of the theory nor reflects its features, so much so that even Lenin, – and he was the first Russian who was engaged in the struggle of realising the practice (striving to establish socialism) and was its leader – was not able to foretell the time of its occurrence, and that in the shape of the lolling out of the revolution till the revolution came just within sight and it is far no other reason than this that the social pointers and the social events. The guide marks of the society on the brink of the defacto socialist revolution cannot be at all applicable to the pointers and events on the basis of which the theory is determined. Lenin had delivered to a gathering of the Swiss Youth, a month before the February revolution and ten months before the October revolution, a speech in which he said:

Perhaps we also belong to order generation of you may not live to see the fierce socialist revolution which is on the brink of pushing out its tongue. But it appears to me I can express with the highest of assurance of the hope that it will be possible for the worker-youths of Switzerland and other youths in all parts of the world engaged in the splendid socialist movement to have the good fortune not only of sharing in the fight during the impending proletariat revolution but also of emerging victorious from it.

Only after ten months, Lenin said this and socialist revolution was made possible and lolled out into move in Russia, bringing with it, the rule while for the Swiss worker-youths engaged in the splendid socialist movement it has not yet been possible in his words to have the good fortune, he hoped for them

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

as to sharing in the proletariat revolution and emerging victorious from it.

THIRD: WAS MARXISM ABLE TO COMPREHEND HISTORY IN ITS ENTIRETY?

Marxism, as has been stated earlier, is a collection of assumption each one of which is specific to a particular stage of history and from the totality of these assumptions the general assumption of the interpretation of history is formed that the society is always begotten of (socio) economic formation determined and imposed upon it by the productive forces.

Truly, what is the most outstanding in Marxism and the greatest of its analytic powers and constitutes its line and attractiveness is this power of its all inclusiveness and comprehensiveness which makes it preferable to many other interpretations of the economic and social operations. It explains within its frame the determinate firm inter-connection between various of these operations in all the human fields; for Marxism is not of a limited ideology or a social, economic or political analysis only, but is an explanatory analysis which includes within it all the social, economic and political operations as they proceed for thousands of years in the long course of history.

It is but natural for such a theory as this to appropriate to itself the destiny of man and to inspire them with wonder so long as it pretends to man that it has placed in their hands every mystery of mankind and every enigma of history, and as long as it surpasses all other scientific theories on the point of social and economic theory by great weight to the great mass of people, which is that it has been able in raising the future prospective expectations of man by scientific analyses and to advance their false desires created on logical and materialist foundations to the proportion it was possible for Marx to carry them to. There are

no other scientific methods to overcome in the social and economic fields except by the help of their board of Experts.

And as we have already learnt, historical, materialism as a general assumption establishes that all the social formations and social phenomena spring from (socio) economic formation and the (socio) economic formation in its turn comes into existence as a result of formation of productive forces, for, the economic formation is the connecting link between the chief force of production and all other social forms and social phenomena just as Plekhanov says:

It is the economic form of any people (whatsoever) which determines its social form and the social form of this society in its turn determines its religious and political form and so and so forth... But you will ask would not there be some causes for the economic form, also? Undoubtedly, like everything else in the world, it too has its own cause, ... it is the struggle with nature man is engaged in. (Plekhanov, *Materialist Conception of History* [Arabic transl.], p.46).

Indeed the productive relations determine all the other relations which bring about concord between people in their social life. As for the productive relations, it is the form of productive force determines them. (*ibid.*, p.48)

So, it is the productive forces which create the economic form and the economic form follows in its development the development of the productive forces. The economic form is the basis of the edifice of the social structure and whatsoever of all its other forms and phenomena. This is the general stand point of historical materialism.

* * * * *

Two challenging questions are oft repeated in the pages of the books of the challengers of the Marxist ideas, calling in

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

question Marxist historicism as a general theory of history.

First: If the course of history is subject to the rule of the economic factor and the productive forces, in accordance with the laws of nature and is led by it from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to socialism, then why this expenditure of mighty efforts in the way of the massive agglomeration of as great a number as be possible, by the Marxists to kick up a partitioning revolution against capitalism and why they do not let the historical laws to operate and keep from such back-breaking undertaking?

Second: Every man has, necessarily an inner sense of the thing that he is moved by which are directed to ends having connection with an object of economic nature on the contrary, economic interests, even the whole life is, on occasions sacrificed in their path. So how it can be considered that economic factor is the motive force of history?

For the sake of objective scientific discussion we will register our opinion on these two most thorny questions with plainness and precision for both these questions express not so much the erroneousness of the Marxist conception of history itself.

As concerned with the first most question it is necessary for us to understand the Marxist view point vis-à-vis revolution. It is this. Marxism does not consider the exertions it expends in the path of revolution as something apart from the laws of history, it rather considers them a part of those laws which it is necessary to be brought on so as to move history from one stage to another stage. Hence when revolutionaries congregate in the path of revolution they only express the inevitability of history.

While we say this we are aware that Marxist itself has not been able at times to try to understand clearly the demands and the necessary requirements of its scientific conception of history, even Stalin has written:

Society is not helpless before the laws. It is in its power

through gaining knowledge of the economic laws and by reliance upon them to delimit the scope of their action and to utilize them in the service of society and to master them in the same way as it mastered the powers of nature and its laws. (Stalin: *The Role of Progressive Ideas in the Development of Society* [Arabic transl.], p.22).

Politzer also has said a similar thing. He writes:

Dialectical materialism along with its emphasis on the objective nature of the social laws has at the same time laid emphasis on the object part ideas play – that is scientific intellectualize activities in retarding or accelerating, advancing to or hampering the influence of the social laws.(Politzer: *Idealist Materialism in Philosophy*, p.152)

Obviously this avowal of Marxism, man's power through his ideas and intellectual activities over the influence of social laws, and their acceleration or retardation, is not in agreement with its scientific thought vis-à-vis history for if history proceeds in correspondence with the general laws of nature, then the mind will be considered a part of the field over which these laws hold their sway and whatever these roles, these minds or activities would give start to, will be a positive expression of these laws and their inevitable influence not the acceleration or retardation of that influence. Hence when Marxist, for instance, take pains to create convulsions and seditious disorders in order to deepen and aggravate; they are executing and giving effect to these laws. The position of the parties of men working with political mind is not the same in respect of the laws of history as that of the physicist in respect of the laws which he tests in the laboratory. The physicist can accelerate or retard the influence of the physical laws which cause changes in the form of the physical thing he is testing, for the physical laws cannot have their way in his working upon them. He can control them and prepare them to meet the conditions

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

of his experiment. It is not so with the workers in the field of history. It is not possible for them to free themselves from the laws of history or to bring these laws under their control for they always are a component or a part of historical operations over which those laws hold complete sway.

So it is, then, a mistake that Marxism says anything about having control over the laws of society just as it is a mistake to go to the first contention which charges its practical activity as absurd and unjustifiable as long as we know that revolution is a component part of the laws of history.

Now let us take the second moot point: It cites — as usual a list of the drives the motive for which has no connection with anything of economic nature so as to say that the economic factor is the main factor. This moot question does not meet the point of dispute like the previous question inasmuch as Marxism does not mean that the economic drive is the only conscious driving force of all actions of man throughout the entire course of history, but leans upon this saying that it is a power which expresses itself in the minds of man in different forms and styles for the behaviour of man's mind proceeds from different objects and motivating ideologies which have no connection with economics whatsoever economic. However the fact is these are all of them superficial expressions of the deeply underlying force and are nothing but means which the economic factor makes use of and drives man towards inevitable historical directions.

We are here obliged to go beyond some of the same textual statements of Marxism which are not confined to this statement but lean towards laying stress on regarding economics as the general aim of all the social activities and not only driving forces from behind for Engels writes:

. . . force is only the means and that the aim is economic advantage and "the more fundamental" the aim is then the means used to secure it the more fundamental in history is

the economic side of the relationship than the political side ... in all the cases of domination and subjection to the present days. Subjugation has always been a stomach filling agency (taking stomach-filling in a very wide sense). (*Anti-Dühring*, vol.ii, p.27)

We have no doubt that Engels wrote this in haste and with little thought and went out racing Marxism itself in the exaggerating the economic factor and said something contradictory to the reality we every time come in contact with, for after we find this stomach filling taking stomach filling in a very wide sense in the words of Engels, not preventing these stomach-fillers from setting up momentous activities in the social field for the taking of realizing their ideal or for the satisfaction of their physical desires.

However, let us leave this and take up the study of the real problems which affect historical materialism and stand in its path, problems the solution of which it has not been possible for Marxism to light upon inasmuch as it has not been able to explain in the light of historical materialism, a number of essential points in history, the elaborate study of which was invariably necessary.

1- THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND MARXISM

The first question is about the productive forces with the change of which history changes. The question is how these productive forces develop and what are the factors which govern their growth and development and why not regard these forces as the supreme factors which govern history instead of those productive forces which are dependent upon them for their growth and development?

Marxists habitually reply that it is the thoughts which man

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

avail of during the course of their experiment with nature and which emanate from these experiments, that in their turn develop these productive forces and take part in their growth. Hence the sources from which the productive forces are developed emerge from them and are not independent of them or of a degree superior to them. The Marxists believe, that the progress in respect of the interchanging effect between the productive forces and the thoughts emerging during their exertion with nature, in dialectic shape expresses the dialectical movement of the development of the productive forces which as productive forces give birth to new ideas, and then return to increase and develop under them.

And this dialective developing characteristic of productive forces, founded on the basis of a special sense of experiment makes ideas and views as the basic unique, providence of man. Hence the relation between the forces of productive nature which man experiments and his ideas and views in respect of the worlds and its facts, becomes a relation of cause with its effect which emerges from it, then interacts with it and increases it in wealth and substance.

But we must not forget the result which we educed from our study of the theory of knowledge. These results prove that the natural experiments present to man only raw materials and surrounds him with nothing but the sensuous images of their content. These materials and sense-images remain meaningless unless they coincide with specific physiological and psychological condition in a definite mind and such a mind is that of man. Man over and above all animals who shares with him the sense-images and sense perception possess intellectual powers of deduction and analysis as well as a prior necessary knowledge. Man takes to apply it to the raw material and data which he has adduced by way of experiment and produces new things. As often as the productive activity is repeated, and its balance is

completed, they are augmented in richness and fruitfulness. So it is not the productive forces, which alone by themselves cut open the way to argument and develop them or give birth to factors which develop and enrich them. They only give birth to sensations and images so in such a case, then, their development is neither dialectical by itself nor does the positive force which develop them emanate from them. Thus the productive forces become subject to a factor which is higher in degree to them in the successive continuity of history.

Till now we have been asking about the productive forces and have arrived at a conclusion not relishing to the Marxists. Nevertheless, it is possible, nay, rather necessary that we go further and ask a more penetrating question and which will drive historical materialism in a tight corner. We will pose the question in the following manner. How was it that man made a practice of productive activity, and that it originated in his life while it did not originate in the life of any other living being?

We know from Marxist doctrine that it believes in production as the fundamental principle of society on the basis of which the social formation rises and it builds up all the other formations on the basis of the economic formation. But it did not take the trouble to inquire a little about the production itself to explain, how production was originated in the life of man. And if the production is held good for explaining the origin of society and its relations and phenomena, are not there conditions which will be held good for explaining the origin and existence of the production?

A reply to this question is possible if we knew what is production. Production, as Marxism has informed us, is the joint activity of a collection of man in their encounter against and struggle with nature for the production of their material needs and that all the relations and phenomena are founded on its basis. It is, then, in that case, an activity undertaken by a number of

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

men to change nature and make it in a shape which agrees with their needs and satisfies their wishes and wants.

An activity such as this undertaken by a number of men cannot come into existence historically unless it is preceded by certain definite conditions which can be summed up in two essential things.

The first of the two things is thought man cannot change nature for the purpose of satisfying his wants. He cannot make flour out of wheat or bread out of flour, unless he is in possession of the image which he will give to nature. The operation of changing cannot be separated from the thinking process from the womb of which the operation will give birth to the shape and form of nature which remain hidden in the initial stage. It was on account of this that it was not possible for the animals to carry on productive activity as positive activity of changing nature.

The second of the two things is language qua, the material manifestation of nature which enables the participants in the productive activity to understand each other and to adopt a united standpoint during the operative process, for unless every one engaged in the joint productive operation possesses the means of expressing and explaining his idea and of comprehending the thought and ideas of his other participants, (his comrades) in the work, he would be unable to produce.

Thus we clearly find that thought, in whatsoever degree it be must precede productive activity and that thought does not issue from productive activity as all the other social relations and social phenomena in the Marxist claim. It only arises from the need of the interchange of thoughts and ideas as the material manifestator of thought; so in that case, then language is not born and grows according to the claimed fundamental law in respect of the activity of production in despite of the fact that it is the most important social phenomena on the whole and that it is only a necessary condition historically in

the existence of this assumed fundamental principle.

The greatest argument in support of this we can produce is the fact that language grows and develops independently of the production and its forces, for, had language been begotten of the production, born according to the claimed fundamental law, then it surely would have developed and changed following the development of the forms of production and their change like all the other social phenomena and relations according to the opinion of Marxism and there is not found a single Marxist – not even Stalin, who dare say that the language of Russia, for instance, underwent change after the socialist revolution and took a new form, or the steam engine, which altered the basic principle of the society and produced a great change in the mode of production, brought with it a new language for the English people –a language different from the one they were speaking before the change took place. Then, it is that history asserts that language production in its continuity and development, is independent of production and it is independent because it was not begotten in this or that form by the form of production but has its source in the thoughts and needs which are deeper and more earlier than every practice of social production in whatever shape or form.

2- IDEOLOGY AND MARXISM

We can consider the relation which holds and on which Marxism lays great stress between the intellectual life of man and the economic formation as well as the formation of the productive force, which determine the entire content of the historical entity of man, as one of the points of the greatest essential weight and importance in the material conception of history according to Marxism, for ideology, whatever higher forms it may have taken, however far it may have gone away from the basic force, what-ever path it may have chosen from

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

among the complicated historical tendencies it would turn out an analysis from being nothing but in the outcome of the main economic factor in one or the other form. It is on this basis that Marxism explains by way of material condition the history of ideology and the revolts and changes stirred up by it.

This frame under which Marxism places all the intellectual thoughts and ideas of man more than all the other aspects of the Marxist structure of history, deserves philosophical and scientific inquiry on account of the weighty results to which it leads vis-à-vis, the theory of knowledge and the determination of its value and its logical criteria. Hence it was necessary to study this view during the course of our discussion of the theory of knowledge. We did do so in our work on philosophy entitled, *Falsafatunā*, but in a cursory manner. Now we find that we should subject it to detailed study and that we are going to do in the second edition of our above named work. However this will not prevent us from dealing with it within the orbit and limits of the present work.

However in order to elucidate the Marxist view with clarity we will concentrate our talk on the main phenomena of the intellectual life. They are: the religious, the philosophical and the scientific and social knowledge.

However, before taking up a detailed study of these topics, we would like to quote, a textual extract from Engels, in which he expresses the Marxist view which we are going to study. He states in a letter to Franz Mehring:

Ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, it is true but with a false consciousness. The real motive forces impelling him, remain unknown to him; other-wise it simply would not be an ideological process. Hence he imagines false or seeming motive forces... and does not further for a more remote source independent of thought (*Social Interpretation of History*, [Arabic transl.] , p.122).

Engels wishes by this to justify the ignorance of all the thinkers of the true sources which created their thoughts and their discovery was possible to none except historical material-ism. It does not mean their ignorance of the sources which historical materialism determines for the course of the human thinking, that it was a false source and that historical materialism was mistaken in its view. It was only necessary that the truth of these sources were disclosed before their eyes, otherwise there would not have been an ideological process.

We, however, may ask Engels truthfully, in our turn, if it really was necessary that the true driving forces of ideology remain hidden from those who entertain them being merely an ideological process, then how was it valid for Engel himself to smash this necessity and perform a miracle, by presenting to humanity a new ideology which remains to enjoy the capacity of being an ideology and yet at the same time it may be in the know of its true sources and true motives?

A– Religion :

Religion occupies a prominent position in the realm of thought. It was on account of the position which it held in this sphere that it has played active role in the making of human intellect or in giving it a concrete form assuming different shapes and manifesting itself in various forms with the passage of times, so in spite of the fact that Marxism had eliminated from its determination of religion all its objective facts, such as, divine revelation, prophecy, and the Creator, it was invariably necessary to fabricate a material explanation of it. It was commonly known and held in the materialist media that religion originated as a result and outcome of man's feeling of weakness before nature and its formidable forces, and of his ignorance of its mysteries and its laws. But this explanation was not agreeable to Marxism

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

for it deviated from its central basis, and does not correlate religion with the economic form having for its basis of production which was necessarily the sole exponent and the source of everything which was in need of explanation and the cause and source. Constantinov says:

Marxist-Leninism always contested such distortion of historical materialism and established the necessity of searching before everything else, for the main-spring of all social, political, legal and religious ideas in the Economics (*The Role of Progressive Ideas in the Development of the Society*, [Arabic transl.], p. 4) .

It was on account of this that Marxism took to searching for the original source of the birth and rise of religion within the economic formation of society and found it ultimately in the class-structure of society. For from the miserable reality in which the oppressed class lives in a class-society springs up the thoughts of religion in the mind of the miserable man. Marx says:

Religious suffering, indeed, is the expression of the real suffering, as also the protest against this suffering at the same time. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of the heartless world, as it is the spirit of the spiritless. It is the opium of the people, so the criticism of religion, then, is the first step towards the criticism of this valley sunk in tears (*Selected Essay's of Marx*, [Arabic transl.], pp.16 — 17) .

Marxist research in this connection agrees on one point. It is this, religion is the product and outcome of the class-conflicts of society. But there is a disagreement as to the mode in which the religion arose from this class-conflict and at times, leans toward saying that, religion is opium which the ruling exploiter also gives to exploited class to drink in order to make it forget its demands and its political role, and submit to the existing evil reality. In this form it is the snare woven by the ruling class to

prey upon and to dupe the toilers and the unhappy.

While Marxism says this, it turns its eyes away from the blatant reality, which points in all the clarity to the fact that religion always grows in the lap of the miserable and poverty-stricken people and fills their souls with its rays before it floods with its light the entire society. Here it is this Christianity. It was none but these beggar apostles who carried its banner to the remote corners of the world and in general and to the Roman Empire in particular. They possessed nothing except the spiritual spark which burned in their soul. Similarly the first collection of the mass which nourished the call of Islam in its laps and which was the nucleus to absorb a still large number, was none other than needy people or the likes of needy people of Mecca so how can it be interpreted that religion was the production of the ruling class which it created to drug the downtrodden and for the protecting of its interest?

If therefore, it is permissible for Marxism to hold the belief, that it was the dominant ruling class which manufactured religion to safeguard its own interest, then we too have the right to ask and was it to the interest of this class, to make out of this religion a powerfully effective weapon the passing a decree against usury which brought huge profit to the Meccan society before it was made absolutely unlawful by Islam. Or make it to let go and renounce all its aristocratic alarms. For the fact that religion imposed by its preaching the equality of men, the human dignity rich nay, even the contempt of the rich and the capping criticism under pretensions of greatness, to such an extent that the Christ said. Any one of you who wants to become great make himself a servant and that "it was easy for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."

We, at times, find Marxism expounds its class-interpretation of religion in another way. It claims that religion springs from the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

depths of despondency and suffering which fails the souls of the down-trodden class; so it is the down-trodden who of themselves fabricate religion in which they find consolation and under its auspices, their hopes. Hence religion is the ideology of the unhappy and the down-trodden and not the fabrication of the rulers.

By a happy coincidence, we learn from the history of the primitive societies that religion is not on the ideological phenomena of the class-societies only, even the primitive societies, which Marxism thinks, existed live in the state of classless communistic societies practised an ideology of this kind and colour, religious life appeared in these societies in various forms and shapes so it is not possible to give a class explanation of history or to regard it as an intellectual expression of the reflexion of the conditions of down-troddness which surrounds the exploited class. When it is found existing in the life of rational man before the class-structure came into existence, and before the valley was sunk under the tears of the oppressively exploited humanity. Then how would Marxism be able to make economic formation as the basis of the explanation of religion?

Then there is another thing. If religion be the ideology of the down-trodden and oppressed springing from the reality of their miserable state, as Marxism assumes in the second version of its explanation of it, then how would it be possible to explain the existence of the religious belief divorced from the real state of misery and the circumstance and conditions of economic oppression? And how would it be possible for the class not down-trodden, not oppressed to accept from the oppressed down-trodden class and ideology which rises up from its economic reality and the religion which it preaches?

Marxism cannot deny the existence of a religion with persons not related to the circumstances of economic oppressions and the firmness of the hold of the faith on the heart of some of these persons to the degree of sacrificing their

very life for its sake. This clearly proves that a thinker does not always get inspiration to an ideology from economic reality, for the religious ideology was not an expression of their misery and the deep sight of their hard lot; consequently it was not a reflection of their economic circumstances but was a creed which corresponded with their mental and intellectual conditions: they believed in it on the basis of their ideology.

Marxism is not content with giving class-economic explanation of religion, but holds more than this. It tries to explain its evolution on the economic basis, too. (It says), when the economic conditions of a people developed and facilitated it to set itself up as an independent community the gods its people worshipped were national gods whose authority did not exceed the bounds of the national territory of the people they were called to protect. After these people ceased to exist as independent nation on their being incorporated in the world empire —The Roman Empire, there arose the need of a world-religion too. Christianity was this world religion and it became the formal religion of the state two hundred fifty years after its birth. Thereafter Christianity was formed by the feudal conditions. When it in the shape of Catholicism came into conflict with the growing bourgeois forces, there appeared the movement of the protestant religious movement.

We may here observe that had Christianity or Protestantism, been the expression of the object materialist needs — as is pointed out by Marxism, it naturally would have been born grown up in the lap of the Roman Empire, which had assumed the reins of world's leadership and the religious reformation would have taken — birth in most of the communities in which bourgeois was developing and multiplying. But the historical reality is quite different from this.

Christianity did not arise at the points of political centraliza-

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

tion nor was it born and in the bosom of the Romans who built up the world-empire nor were they expressing it in their activities, but it arose at a place far from all these things in one of the Eastern colonies of the Romans and grew up among the oppressed Jewish people, dreaming ever since their country was made a colony of the Roman Empire at the hand of the Roman leader Bembi, six decades before the birth of Christ, of nothing but of natural independence and of breaking the fetters of their bondage to the imperialists – a matter – which cost them many revolts and the sacrifice of tens of thousands of lives during the course of these six decades. Were the material, political, economical circumstances of this people congenial to the birth travail of a world – religion which may answer to the needs of the colonizing empire?

And the movement of religious reformation, the vanguard of the movement of freedom of thought in Europe was the other movement. It too was not begotten by the bourgeois forces. Although it reaped great benefits from it but that does not mean that as a definite ideology it arose merely by the bourgeois, economic development. If that were so it should have arisen in England, for the conditions in that country were more suitable for its rise. Bourgeois in that country had grown more powerful than in any other country in Europe. Also other countries in Europe had not yet attained to the level of the economic and political development it had attained to during her revolutions since 1215. Yet in spite of this Luther did not appear in England in answer to bourgeois mentality but in a place far from it, in Germany and carried on the activity and his mission in that country. Likewise another principal leader of it, in the person of Calvin the most pertinacious, Protestant appeared in France during whose time a number of horrifying massacres and natural grappling took place between the Catholics and Protestants, and the German prince, William Orange rose with a great army in defence of the

new movement.

It is true, England after this formally adopted the Protestant creed under any circumstance, not out of the fabric of its bourgeoisies mentality but out of a mentality which existed in the feudal countries.

And if we take the Marxist ideology of religions, and apply it to Islam, another world religion, we will find glaring contradiction between the ideology and reality. Europe being a world-state was in need of a world religion but there was no world state like it, for that matter in the Arabia. There did not exist even national state consisting of Arab people only that Arab people were divided into tribal groups, a number of several tribal groups, every tribe had its god carved of in whom they believed, and before whom they bowed down. After having carved it out of stone they had made it their god and used to pay the homage of their worship for it. Did such material and political condition call for the emergence of one single world religion from the heart of such and so divided a country, and which had not yet learnt how to attain to its existence as a people and a nation, not to mention, to have the understanding of oneness of a higher category as follows from a religion which unites the entire world? So if it be that the religious gods evolve out of national gods to a world God, following upon the material needs and political formations how was it that the Arabs leapt from the god's they fashioned with their hands with a leap, to a world God, in the highest degree of abstraction, to whom they offered their submission?

B- Philosophy:

Philosophy too according to Marxism is another intellectual manifestation of the material life and economic conditions in which the society lives, and which are their positive products.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Konstantinov says:

Among the laws which are common to the formation of all societies and in particular the socialist society, we may mention the law which holds that social existence determines social cognition. In fact the sociological, juridical, aesthetical and philosophical ideas are the reflections of the material condition of social life (*The Role of Progressive Ideas in Evolution of Society* [Arabic transl.], p.8)

We will give briefly our view-point in this respect. We do not deny even once, the connection between ideas and the economic conditions in which the thinkers live. Likewise we do not deny the systems and laws of ideas as they being part of the phenomena of nature, are subject like other phenomena to laws, and occur in accordance with the principle of causality. Every process of ideology has its own causes and conditions to which it is correlated like all other phenomena which are correlated to their causes and conditions. Our difference with Marxism is as to the determination of these causes and conditions. Marxism holds that the real cause of every ideological process lies hidden behind the material and economic conditions, so, according to its view, it is not possible for us to explain the idea in the light of its relation with other ideas, and their mutual interaction and on the basis of the psychological and intellectual conditions, but only through the agency of the economic, for ideology has no independent history of its own or a specific development to it, but only is the history of the inevitable reflections of socio-economic and material conditions have effected in the human intellect. The scientific method by which it is possible for us to examine this inevitability and compare the theory with the course of the events and the course the intellectual and social life of man.

There are extant several texts of Marxism, for the exposition of this theory and its application to the field of

philosophy. These texts, as we shall see from the following texts at one time explain history by the change in the productive forces, and at another time by the level of the physical science, and at a third time, considers it as class manifestation, determined by the conditions of the class-order of the society.

The British Communist Philosopher, Morris Cornforth says: And the other thing which is worthy of our observation is the effect of technical inventions and scientific discoveries, on the manifestation of philosophical ideas. (*Dialectical Materialism* - [Arabic transl.], p.40)

He means by this to establish a nexus between the philosophical thinking and the evolution of the means of production and expounds this in another content by presenting a sample of it from the conception• of evolution which dominated the philosophical rationalism by the reason of the revolutionary change in the forces of production. He says:

The advancement of science towards evolutionary conception, and which expresses the discovery of the actual evolution of nature and society, corresponded with the development of the industrial capitalism in the later part of the eighteenth century. Obviously, this correspondence was not merely a pure correspondence but expressed a causal nexus ... Bourgeois would not have lived had not the continuous revolutionary changes in the modes of production were brought in ... it was these conditions which led to the general appearance of the general conception of the evolution of nature and society. Because of this the importance of philosophy in the generalization of laws of change and evolution, did not result merely from the scientifically discoveries but was rather tied with every movement of the new society in its entity (*ibid.* [condensed], pp. 8 — 9).

Thus the means of production were changing and taking new forms, and flinging at the brain of the philosophers the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

conceptions of evolution which put an end to the static philosophical theory of nature and transferred it to revolutionary view which corresponded with the continuous evolution in the means of production.

We would content ourselves with saying that the revolutionary changes in the means of production began in the later part of the eighteenth century as Cornforth himself has pointed out that after the invention of steam-engine in the year 1764. Which represents the first actual revolutionary change in the mode of production. But formulation of the conception of evolution – on the material basis – preceded this date, at the hand of one of the great leaders of materialist philosophy the eulogies of whose views and whose glory, Marxism recites, I mean Diderot, (i) who appeared in the realm of philosophy in the first half of the 18th century with materialism moulded in the form of self evolution. He said matter changes by self-movement and explained life on the basis of evolution. According to him the living, evolve first from the' cell created by the life-matter (protoplasm) whence the organs create needs and needs create organs. Therefore, did Diderot obtain this philosophical conception of evolution from the revolutionary changes in the mode of production which appeared on the stage of production later on?!

It is true that radical change in the production field prepares to a certain extent, the acceptance of the philosophical idea of change and its application to all the accompaniments of nature. But this does not mean necessary causality and an inevitable tying up of the philosophical idea of evolution with the evolution of production not admitting of antecedence or subsequence. If that were so how did it permit Diderot to outship this claimed inevitableness?!/or, for that matter it permitted philosophers who lived more than a thousand years before make evolution the basic principle of their philosophy?

On the other hand, the Greek philosopher Anaximander¹ who lived in the sixth century B.C. gave to philosophy a conception of evolution which was not different in essence from the conceptions of evolution prevalent in the age of capitalist production. He held that creatures in their first state were lowly things then impelled by the power of their native motive force moved on by evolutionary process to higher and higher steps to concordance between itself and the external environment. Man, for instance, was aquatic animal- but when water was swept off, this aquatic animal was obliged to seek congenial environment. So he acquired by the passage of time organs suitable for locomotory movement, to enable him to move up about on dry land and thus became man.

The other philosopher was Heraclitus, whose share in the conceptions of philosophical evolution was great. Even Marxism considers him an outstanding exponent of the essentials of dialectics, and esteemed highly his views in respect of the theory of evolution. Heraclitus lived in the fifth century B.C.² He gave to the world of philosophy the conception of evolution based on the opposites and the dialectics. He affirmed that nature does not remain in a fixed state but is in continuous flux. This change from one form into another form and the motion are the reality of nature, for the things will not cause changing from one state into another up to the end of eternity; and explains this motion by the law of opposite which means that a thing in motion 'is' and is changing that is existent and non-existent at the same instance and this union of two instances of existence and non-existence is the meaning of motion which is the essence of nature and its reality.

This philosophy of Heraclitus, if it proves anything, it proves

-
1. Anaximander born 611 B.C. died about 547 B.C. approximately.
 2. Heraclitus born 535 B.C. died 475 B.C.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

that Marxism was mistaken in its explanation of philosophy and its emphasis on its lying up the advancement of philosophy with the advancement of the mode of production and technical discoveries. Especially when we learn that Heraclitus was the most behind hand in the philosophical advancement of his time and its discovery in nature and astronomy and not to mention, its present-day-advancements; so behind hand that he even believed the diameter of the sun was one human footstep, as appears to the eye and explains its setting as extinguishment of it in water.

And, why go so far, when we have before us the great Islamic philosopher Şadru 'd-Din ash-Shīrāzi (Iran) who brought about a mighty revolution in the Islamic philosophy at the rise of the 17th century, when he presented to the Islamic Thought with the most profound and philosophy which the history of this thought had ever witnessed and established by his philosophy the essential movement of nature and the continuous evolution in the essence of Universe on the basis of abstraction philosophy. He established this in the days when the modes of production were at standstill in the traditional shape with the passage of times and every thing in life was at standstill, yet the philosophical guidance impelled our philosopher ash-Shīrāzi to the affirmation of the law of evolution of nature in the face of all this.

It is then, that there is no inevitable relation between the philosophical conception and the economic forms of the productive forces.

Then, there also is another thing of special significance in this connection. That is, if the economic system of the productive forces and their relations were the sole real basis for the explanation of the intellectual life of society including the philosophical ideas current there, then the natural consequence of it would have been that the advancement in the philosophical ideas would have followed the evolution in the economic form and would

have run its course in accordance with the movement of the completion of the relations of production and its forces. According to this it would become necessary that the trends towards philosophical advancement and the great philosophical revolution should spring from and born in the countries, economically highly advanced. Thus the share of every country in the matter of ideological progress and revolutionary philosophy shall be in proportion to its share of economic development and precedence to the circumstances of production and its relations.

Is this sequence in consonance with the history of philosophy? This is what we are now proposing to know.

Let us take a look at the state of Europe when the first gleams of new revolutionary ideas flickered on its horizon. What we see is England enjoying the relatively highest degree of economic development. The like of which France and Germany had not been able to achieve. The English people had achieved great political gains which people of France and Germany had been able to achieve nothing of these things. The technical economic forces (bourgeoisie forces) in England were in a flux of continued increase, and did not resemble the form of these forces in other countries. In brief, the social form of England with its economic and political conditions, according to Marxist belief was on the higher steps of the ladder of historical development than that of France or Germany. For England started its revolutionary movement of liberation (1215 A.C.) and made it a plunge into the great revolution, in the middle of the seventeenth century, (1648 A.C.) under the leadership of Cromwell, while the decisive conditions for revolution had not been ready in France till the year 1784 nor in Germany till the year 1848. These revolutions were bourgeoisie revolutions springing from their degree of economic development. According to Marxism, prove by what they point as to the time difference between them to the precedence of England in the economic field.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

If England was economically developed more than any other country, than it was natural, on the basis of Marxist theory for it to take precedence over these other countries in the field of philosophy and to become more progressist than they in its philosophical trend which, according to Marxism, is the material trend which should be more advanced when it is founded on the basis of change and motion.

Here we may ask. Where was materialism born and attained maturity? In which country its first glimmerings appeared and then lolled out the tongue of its storm. It appears here that Marxism will find itself be pushed in a critical position for its theory to the interpretation of philosophy on economic basis calls upon it to say at economic development of England imposes upon her to appear on the stage of philosophy with progressive trend or in other words, material trend. It was because of this that Marx sought to say, that the materialism was given birth in England, at the hand of Francis Bacon and the Nominalises (Marx: *Socialist Interpretation of History*, p.76)

But we all know that Bacon was not a materialist philosopher but was sank deep in idealism. He only urged upon experiment and encouraged adoption of empiricism method in investigation. As for the English nominalist belong a kind thinking of materialism, then there have been before them two philosophers. French philosophers who having this kind of philosophical idea in the early part of the fourteenth century. One of whom was Duran-desan Boursan and the other was Pierre Orival. And if we want to dive deeply in our search in respect of the preamble thoughts which prepared the ground for the materialist trend prior to Nominalist movement, we will find the Latin version of the movement to Averroism which appeared in France in the thirteenth century, and into which the majority of professors at the Paris university of arts adhered. At their hand, separation of philosophy from religion was effected and with that began

the trends towards denial of the universally accepted principles of religion.

The materialist trend was disclosed in its explicit form by a person or persons, like Hobes in England; yet it was not able to gain dominant philosophical position in England, or seize the reins from the hands of idealism. While it effected so great a materialist storm on the philosophical stage in France that it drowned that country in the materialist trends. And at the time when the intellectual France was feasting itself with and making the most of Voltaire, Diderat and their likes, from among the leaders of materialism in the eighteenth century; we find England in wallowing in the deepest and the ugliest form of idealist philosophy poured out by the hand of George Berkeley and David Hume, the chief missionaries of the modern idealist philosophy.

Thus the results have come quite contrary to Marxist's expectations in history. For the idealist philosophy or in other words the most reactionary philosophy according to Marxism, blossomed in the most advanced and the economically and technologically most developed country whilst the strong winds of materialism chose for them a place in a country economically and socially backward like France. For that even evolutionary materialism and the dialectics themselves did appear in Germany when it was several degrees behind England as to its material conditions.

Yet Marxism wants us to confirm its interpretation of the philosophical thinking and its evolution on the basis of the economic formation and its development.

If Marxism also tried to find justification from the variations as to explain away the exception to the laws, then what shall remain with her as a proof of the soundness of the law itself, to constitute these variations as exceptions?? Why do not the variations constitute as a proof of the unsoundness of the law

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

itself instead of our seeking from here or there excuses for it?!!!

From this we deduce what has been stated above that there does not exist inevitable relation between the philosophical conceptions of the society and the economic system of the productive forces operating in that society.

* * * * *

As for the relation between philosophy and natural science, it depends upon the detailed study and examination of the determination of the meaning of philosophy and the meaning of science and the basis upon which philosophical and scientific thinking rests to enable us to learn as to the inter-connection and interaction between the two departments of knowledge. This we shall learn from our book *Falsafatunā* but we will not leave this occasion without expressing in general terms our doubt about the assumed following of natural sciences upon the heels of philosophy. It has happened at times, that philosophy has been before science in taking some of the directions in the explanation of nature, and then science took part, in its own special way with same course. The most obvious example of it is the atomic explanation of nature which was given by the Greek philosopher, Democritus and in the course of history, several schools of philosophy were founded on that basis before natural sciences had reached the level in which made it possible to prove this explanation. The explanation continued bearing the characteristic stamp of philosophy till it found its way to the field of science in 1805, at the hand of Dutton who sought to make use of the atomic hypothesis to explain static relation holding in chemistry.

* * * * *

So, the only thing which remains for us to inquire into the clarification of the class-stamp of philosophy, for Marxism asserts that philosophy cannot be divested of its class frame, rather it is the permanent elevated rational explanation of the interest of a definite class. Morris Cornforth says:

Philosophy always expresses and cannot but express the class outlook. Since every philosophy represents the world outlook of a certain class, a way by which a class achieves its historical position and its historical aims; schools of philosophy represented the world outlook (view) of the privileged class or of a class which has been fighting to become a privileged class. (*Material Dialectics*: [Arabic transl.], p.32)

However, Marxism is not content with saying this in a general way, but dots the 'i's and crosses the 't's of this pronouncement of it; and asserts that idealist philosophy (and by this it means every philosophy which denies material explanation of the universe) is a philosophy of the ruling class and exploiting minorities which embrace the idealism —throughout the history — as a conservative philosophy to assist it for keeping up the old standing on its legs; where as the materialist philosophy is the opposite of this. Since it always expresses the philosophical conception of the oppressed classes, stands up by their side in struggling and consolidates the Democratic rule and the people's guardian. (vide: *Studies in Social Life* [Arabic transl.], p.81).

Marxism expounds these opposite stand point of the idealist and materialist philosophies on the basis of their difference as to the theory of knowledge of these two philosophy. In doing so, it lands into the confounding of the theory of knowledge vis-à-vis the field of nature with the theory of knowledge vis-à-vis the field of ethics. It thinks that the emphasis of idealist philosophers on the absolute realities of existence implies their belief in the existence also of an absolute guardian for the social formation.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

For as long as the idealists or metaphysicians, believe in the highest reality (Allāh) the absolutely existent and absolutely established (God); it believes also that the highest manifestations of society as to government, political and economic formations are also absolutely established realities or not admitting of their alteration or replacement by another thing.

The fact, however, is that the existence of the absolute realities according to the philosophical theory of knowledge as held by the metaphysicians and its concept of existence does not mean the acknowledgement like this of the absolute general inclusion of the social and political field. It is because of this that we find Aristotle, the leader of philosophy of metaphysics, believes in relativity in the political field, and owns that (the conception of) the good government differs with the difference in the existing state of affairs and circumstance and that his belief in the absolute realities in the field of metaphysical philosophy did not prevent him from a belief in this relative goodness in the social field.

We will leave a minute study of this aspect to our work *Falsafatunā* and stop here for a moment to think as to whether history confirms those claims which Marxism makes in respect of the historical class trends of idealism and materialism.

We may choose two examples in particular from the history of materialism the first of them, Heraclitus the greatest materialist philosopher of the ancient world and the second, Hobbes, who is considered the pole-star of modern philosophy.

As Heraclitus, he was as a man the farthest from public spirit which Marxism has poured copiously into the essence of its materialist philosophy. He belonged to an aristocratic noble family enjoying a high position among the citizen of Greece. Good fortune had willed to raise him gradually from one high position to another in the state till he was installed as the governor of a dependency. He expressed always and in all his

dealings his aristocratic disposition, was disdainful towards the people, and looked with contempt at them, and even sometimes would call them as "cattle preferring grass to gold" and sometimes to call them "dogs barking at every one they knew not".

Thus in the ancient time dialectical materialism was given concrete form at the hand of a person who can be called the prop of the proper role. Whilst the founder of idealism, in the Greek world, Plato, preached a revolutionary thought which was embodied in the absolute communistic system pronouncing doom and destruction of every form of private ownership. So, which of the two philosophers were nearer to revolutionism and principles of liberation according to Marxism?

And Hobbes, who held aloft the banner of pure materialism in the age of renaissance, in opposition to metaphysician. Descartes, was, as to constitution, no better than Heraclitus. He was a tutor of a prince of the royal family of England (the prince was later installed on the throne of England under the name of Charles the second in the year 1660) during whom the great popular rising of the English people took place under the leadership of Cromwell and the revolution demolished the throne of the monarchy and erected in its place the republic, with Cromwell as its head. Due to his relationship with the prince, our materialist philosopher was compelled to flee and take refuge in France which was the strong hold of monarchy. There, he continued help advance to the idea of absolute monarchy and wrote his book *Leviathan* in which his political philosophy was given. In it he laid emphasis on the need of divesting the people of their liberty and the establishment of monarchy on the basis of absolute autocracy. And at the very time that materialist philosophy was emphasizing this political trend at the hand of Hobbes; (metaphysical) philosophy was taking an opposite stand in the person of a number of its eminent champions, who were the contemporary of Hobbes like the mystic philosopher Baruch

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Spinoza who believed in the right of the people to criticise the ruling authority even to revolt against it and preached the democratic rule in whatever amplifies the participation of the people in the ways of governing and strengthens the unity.

So which of the two philosophies is in the cavalcade of democracy and in the cavalcade of autocracy, the philosophy of Heraclitus, the aristocratic, or the philosophy of Plato, the exponent of the republic in a book of that name? The philosophy of Hobbes, the autocratic or the philosophy of Spinoza, the preacher of the people's right of participation in the government.

Now, there remains for us one other thing to turn our attention to. It is this; since philosophical thinking according to Marxism, is a class thinking will always be partisan thinking — (with a permanent tinge of party prepossession and party bias). In such a case, then, it is not possible for a philosopher to study matters of human thought in a purely objective manner, but on the contrary, all such studies are noisily tinged with party colour. It is because of this that Marxism does not keep from displaying party spirit in its philosophical studies and in its particular thinking and acknowledging the impossibility of adopting objectivism in respect of the discussion of such matter or toward thinkers. It always reiterates that adoption of objective viewpoint and complete impartiality is a bourgeois idea which must be ruled out. The great Marxist writer Chagin says:

Lenin has always contended with firmness and persistence . . . against objectivism in theory and against the non-partiality and non-partisanship of the bourgeoisie. Since the year 1890, Lenin has been directing spear thrust against the bourgeois objectivism advocated by the revisionists who were criticizing the party view-point in theory and demanding freedom in the the field of theory. . . he made it clear in his fight against the Marxist — revisionist and against the tendency of the reactionaries that the Marxist

theory must be declared with clarity, even to the utmost, the principle of proletarian party-spirit . . . and in order to evaluate properly this or that event in the social evolution the look at it should be from the angle of the interest of the working- class and the historical evolution of this class . . . for it is the party-spirit which impresses upon the mind of the working- class the historical need of the proletarian dictatorship rather than the scientific justification of it. (Chagin: *Partisan Spirit in Philosophy and Science*, [Arabic transl.], pp.72 -79)

Lenin himself said:

Materialism enjoins party stand point for in the evolution of every event it compels the adoption clearly and without subterfuge, of the view point of a definite social group. (*The History of the Evolution of Philosophy*, [Arabic transl.], p.21).

It was on the basis of this that Gidanov directed slashing criticism against the book on the history of Western Philosophy by Alexandrov, in which the author calls for showing indulgence and adoption of objective attitude in the discussion by saying:

What important, on my view point, is that the author quotes from Chrnyshevski, to explain that the founders of different philosophical systems, even the opposing ones, must be more indulgent to one another. But the author quoted this passage (of Chrnyshevski on indulgence and objectivism) without comment. It is then clear that it represents his own personal point of view. And, since it is like that, he was obviously applying the principle of denying the party stand in philosophy, which is essential in Marxism-Leninism. (*The History of the Evolution of Philosophy* [Arabic transl.], p.18).

We on our part, may ask in the light of these texts; what does Marxism intend by its accentuation on partisan approach

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

in philosophy and proposition towards the view point of the class whose interest it stands for? If Marxism means by it that Marxist philosophers should make the interest of the working class the criterion for the acceptance or rejection of any view (or opinion) and should not allow themselves to adopt any ideology which conflicts with that interest though there are multiple proofs and evidences, the meaning of this will be that it will wrest from our minds any 'trust in their dictum and make us doubt belief in any opinion they express or any ideology they ardently uphold. It is then possible that Marx knows better than anyone else of his errors which he was defending and presenting them as miracles of contemporary thought.

But if Marxism means by partisan stand that every individual is related to a class and upholds its interests, being drawn without intention towards any of the conceptions and views which meet with the interests of that class and howsoever he may try to make a pretension of and impose upon himself the objective attitude in discussion, it is not possible for him to get himself rid of his class bias and class character. If this is what Marxism means then it amounts to acceptance of subjective relativism which it has been always fighting against.

Possibly the readers of our book *Falsafatunã* may be remembering the doctrine of subjective relativism. This doctrine holds that truth is not conformity of idea with objective reality but the conformity of the idea with the particular conditions of the psycho-physiological constitution of an individual's mind. Truth in respect of every individual is what conforms with the particular constitution of his mind and not what conforms with the external reality. It is for this reason a subjective reality in the sense that it differs from one person to another and that what is true for one person, is not so for another person.

Marxism has fulminated violently against this subject of relativity and considers truth to be that which conforms with

objective reality. And since objective reality can be changing, evaluating, then the truth also will reflect it changingly. Thus it is a relative truth. But the relativity here is objective, resulting from objective reality and not subjective, resulting from the psycho-physiological constitution of the individual thinker. This is what Marxism says in its theory of knowledge. But by its emphasis upon class and partisan stamp of thought and upon the impossibility of a thinker's dispossessing himself of the interest of the class with which he is related, bring it to the path of subjective relativism *de novo*, since truth comes to be that which conforms with the interest of the class to which the thinker belongs, for no thinker is able to cognize the reality except within the bounds of his class-interest. Hence when Marxism presents to us its conception of nature and society, it will not be possible for it to claim for its conception the power to present the picture of reality, all that it will be able to establish on the reality sides will be that it reflects what corresponds with the interest of the working-class. The criterion of truth, for every school of thought is the extent of the agreement of the ideology with the class-interest which it stands for. And truth, by then will become relative for it is differing from one thinker to another, not according to the psychological and physiological constitution of the individuals, but according to class-constitution and class-interests to which the individuals are related. So the relative-classtruth differs with the difference of classes and their interests, and not objective relativity for it is neither possible to assure that the truth contains of an objective part of reality nor to fix it as long as Marxism does not allow the thought, whatever be its character or colour, to exceed the bounds of class-interests, and as long as the class-interests always suggest what thoughts to be diffused, regardless of being wrong or right. This will result in a strong doubt about all philosophical facts.

C-(Scientific) Knowledge:

We do not propose to make a long stop before scientific ideas, for fear of the recitals. Nevertheless, whatever our stopping be, Marxism will repeat the same song which we have been listening to in the field of philosophy as well as in the field of everyone of the various utilities of human existence. According to its opinion, all the natural sciences progressively advance and grow in correspondence with the material needs opened up to them by the economic formation, and take on new forms step by step in the wake of the development and improvement of the economic circumstances and conditions. But since these circumstances are the historical consequences of the productive forces and modes of production, there is no wonder if Marxism reaches in its interpretation of the scientific life the same result as it did at the end of every course of its analysis of historical movement and many sided operations. For every historical phase is economically shaped in accordance with its mode of production, and partakes in the scientific movement to the extent, imposed upon by the economic reality and its material needs springing from this reality. For example, the discovery by science of the motive power of steam in the later part of the eighteenth century was born of the economic conditions and was the outcome of the need of capitalist production for a great power for running the machinery upon which this production depended. The same was the case with all the inventions and discoveries with which history of science is brimming.

R. Garaudy in elucidating the dependence of sciences upon the technical and economic form of the productive forces, mentions that it is the technical level the productive force attain to which poses problems before the science and imposes upon it the duty of search and the seeking of their solution. It advances and improves as it engages itself in finding solution of these

problems, arising from the development and evolution of the productive forces and their professional and technical forms. On this basis, Garaudy explains to us how it is that several scientists could simultaneously achieve the same discovery like that of the equilibrium of heat and work made at the same time, by three scientists namely Camot, in France, Joule, in England and Mayer, in Germany. Just as the development of the productive forces place before science problems for solution, so likewise, he explains the dependence of sciences upon the form of productive forces by another reason. It is that the development of the form of these forces prepare for the science the tools and instruments of investigation to make use of and assures it the supply of all the instruments necessary for making observation, experimentation and test. (vide: *Partisan Spirit in the Sciences*, [Arabic transl.] , pp.11 -13).

In what follows we will give our observations on this Marxist stand point as regard the explanation of the science:

a- If we make exception of the modern time, we will find that all the societies which existed before were to a great extent alike as to their means and modes of production and there was no essential difference whatsoever between them in this respect, Simple agriculture and handicraft were the two forms of production in these different societies. This means, according to Marxist usage, that the basic principle on which these societies were found was the same, yet in spite of this, they differ a great deal from each other as to the level of scientific knowledge. So if the forms and instruments of production were the main factors which determine, the contents of the (scientific) knowledge of every society and the progress of the movement of science according to the degree of its historical development then we would neither be able to find the explanation for this difference nor the justification for the flourishing of science in a society over another inasmuch as the main force which makes history is

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

one in all these societies.

Then why did the society in Europe of middle ages differ, for example, from the Muslim societies in Spain, Iraq and Egypt, when the basis shared in common by them was of the same kind? And why did the scientific progress in the Islamic societies flourish in different fields in a relatively high degree while not a glimmer of it was found in the Western Europe which was astonished during the crusade war by what it found from the Muslim nation of sciences and civilization?

And why was it that ancient China alone was able to invent the printing press and that no other society was able to do so, but had come by it through her? The Muslims acquired this art of printing from Chinese in the 8th Century A.D., and from the Muslims, did Europe in the 13th Century A. D. Is it that the economic basis adopted by the ancient China differed essentially from that of other societies? !

b- Though, in many times, the scientific efforts express the socio-material need for innovation, this need cannot be the only principle interpretation of the history of science and its progress. For many needs have remained thousand of years waiting the scientific word on their concern. Their simple existence in the human material life, did not enable them to attain any part in the science, until the time came to science itself to reach a degree which foreordained it to fill this need. Let us take as an example of a scientific discovery which can now appear banal, yet at that very moment a brand new scientific progress; it is the invention of eyeglass. The necessity of human being towards an eyeglass (for example) is old as well as man himself. But this material need remained awaiting its final round until the dawn of the 13th century, when Europe had been able to acquire from Muslims their knowledge about the light reflection and diffraction. Subsequently, the scientists were able to fabricate the eyeglass according to these facts. Therefore, was this scientific event a newly

necessity born through the economic and material reality of the societies?! Or was it an outcome of thinking factors which led to the degree of progress and perfection?!

And if there is any possibility to interpret the science and scientific discoveries through a need springing from economic situations, then how can it be possible to us to understand the European discovery in the 13th century of the magnetic power to determine the direction, when the magnetic needle was used to direct the course of the ships?! Since the maritime route was the principle one for trading during the precedent centuries. The Roman mercantiles depended mainly on the sea-route; and in spite of that, it neither became possible for them to discover from the magnetic, its power to direct the ships; nor did their needs arising from the economic reality intercede on their behalf; while some historical traditions tells us that China had succeeded in discovering it for nearly twenty centuries ago.

It has happened for science to be a head of social needs in its conquests in case the ideal conditions for its new conquest have been complete. The motive power of steam was, according to Marxism, one of the need of industrial capitalist society. Yet science discovered it in the third century A. D.* more than ten centuries before the first indications of industrial capitalism had made their appearance on the stage of history. It is timely that the old societies did not exploit this power of steam, but we are not inquiring about the extent of the capacity of the society as to its deriving benefit from the sciences, we are inquiring about the scientific movement itself and studying as to whether the movement is an intellectual interpretation of regenerated need of the society or is an original movement having its psychological condition and particular history.

c- When Marxism tries to narrow the scope of science on

* Vide Garaudy. *The Partisan Spirit in Philosophy and Science*, (Arabic transl.) p.12,

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the matters and problems which the means of production and their technical forms confine, it falls into the error of confounding the physico-theoretical sciences on one side, with the practical arts on the other. The applied manufactural arts which arise during the course of the usual experiments and probation which are acquired and inherited by the labourers were always subjugated on account of the forces of production and grow subject to the difficulties and questions presented by these forces, and which are demanding mastery answer over them. As for the experimental theoretical sciences, these did not depend upon these difficulties and questions. On the contrary, we find progress of the theoretical science, and the development of an applied art ran their course on two separate lines for a great period of time from the 16th century to 18th century. Thus two centuries passed after the birth of the science in the 16th century before it was possible for the applied art to make a mutual adjustment and this state of affairs continued until the beginning of the electrical industry in the year 1870.

It will be profitable for us to learn in this respect that the general public did not accept the scientific revolution in chemistry which Lavoisier had effected till at the end of the 18th century. And during that the applied arts had been able to make improvements in the iron and steel industry before the artistic-handicraftsmen had learnt the basic chemical differences between wrought iron and hard iron and steel due to the presence of relatively different quantities of carbon in them.

This separation for a long spaces of time between the line of the scientific thinking and the unmingled knowledge of practical art means, that science has its own ideal history and is not only the outcome of the regenerated needs and in fulfilling of their technical requirements.

As for Garaudy's observation about the same scientific discovery made by several scientists at the same time, this does not

prove that the scientific discoveries are always given birth to by the technical conditions, of the means of production as the Marxism wishes to infer from this phenomenon claiming that when the economic and material conditions permit the forces of production to posit a new problem to the scientists and compel them to think out a solution for it, these scientists reach the required solution in times very close to each other because the motive force which drove them to it occurred at the same time during the development of the production.

But this is not the only possible explanation of this phenomenon. On the contrary it is possible to explain it on the basis of the similarity existing between these scientists as to their knowledge, the psychological and ideal conditions and the general scientific level.

The presence of the occurrence of such a phenomenon, in the field of theoretical science, having nothing to do with the problems of production and its development, argues to the possibility of such an explanation. Here is an example of it. Three political economists, dawned upon the theory of economic equilibrium and mutual dependence of prices; at one and the same time. These economists are: Jevons, the English (1871) Wolross the Swiss (1874) and Karl Menger, the Austrian (1871). This theory of mutual dependence is only a definite theoretical explanation of old economic manifestation in the life of human society – the exchange value. Thus the scientific content of the theory has no connection with the problems of production or the progress of productive natural forces.

What explanation could be given of these three eminent economists to have arrived at a specific point of view at one time approximately except that these three were very close to one another as to their ideal conditions and their analytic power?!

d- As for subordination of the physical sciences to the development of the productive forces, as the source which pro-

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

vides science with its necessary instruments for investigation, it is in fact to reverse the relation which exists between them. This is because, though the physical science makes progress with the help of the instruments it attains such as microscope, telescope recorder etc., which enable it to make experiments, tests and minute observation, yet these instruments themselves are the products of the science which it presents before the scientists in order to make it feasible for them, by the use of these instruments to formulate additional theories and to discover unknown mysteries. The invention of the microscope in the 17th century caused a revolution in the means of production for it was able to remove the curtain from the invisible world which man would never have been able to fathom on it. But what is this micro-scope? By itself is a product of science, and the disclosure of the laws of light and the condition of its reflection on lenses.

We should know it in this respect that the instruments do not give the whole story of science for though many of the truth which the instruments of their investigation were ready, yet they remained unknown to man till the mutual interaction and completion of scientific thought reached to a degree which made it feasible for it to discover the truth and to mould it in a particular scientific conception. We can present a simple example of this from the idea of atmospheric pressure, this idea which is considered as one of the greatest conquests of science in the 17th century. Do you know how science was able to register this grand victory? It registered it in the idea which suddenly occurred to the mind of Torricelli when he observed that the water-pump was not able to lift the water higher than 34 feet. This thing had been observed by thousands of labourers in the course of centuries, as also by the great scientist Galileo in particular, but the momentous thing which Torricelli was destined to present to science was the explanation of the phenomenon which was known for centuries. He said the limit to which the pump lifts the water,

does not exceed 34 feet, then this must be measure of t. certain pressure of the atmosphere. And if the atmospheric pressure is able to lift water upto 34 feet vertically then it must be able invariably to lift up mercury to a lesser height vertically than water, for mercury is heavier than water. He soon assured himself of the correctness of this result and established by the method a scientific proof of the existence of the atmospheric pressure, a matter on the basis of which are established many of the discoveries and inventions.

We should make a stop at this scientific discovery, as a historical event in order to ask the question; why did this historical event occur at a definite time during the 17th century and did not take place before this? Was not man in need of the knowledge of the atmospheric pressure before this time to make use of it and husband it for meeting various of his needs? Was not the phenomena in the light of which Torricelli formulated his theory, known for centuries from the very day the water pump came into use?! Or was not the experiment, by which he established his theory, scientifically easy for anyone else who had observed it but had not tried to interpret it?!

If we do not grant to the movement of science as to its root and development arising in accordance with the interaction and accumulation of thoughts and their particular psychological and ideal conditions, then neither this scientific discovery nor science in a general way will find its complete explanation concerning the forces of production and the economic formations.

We will not talk at this moment about the social ideas and their relations with economic factor for this point will be the subject matter of discussion in this book.

3- CLASS - CONCEPTION OF MARXISM

One of the essential point in Marxism is its conception of class,

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

formulated in accordance with its general method of incorporating socio-economic study and always looking at the social significances within the economic framework. It holds the view that classes as social manifestations are only the expressions of the economic values with a class stamp mark, in the form of interests, profit and kinds of usufruct, dominant in a society; such as profit, interest, rate, and other forms of exploitation. For this reason, it lays emphasis on the fact that the economic factor is the real basis for the structure of the class and for the emergence of any class; inasmuch as the division of men into a class possessing all the means of production and the class not possessing any of the means of production is the historical cause of the presence of classes in the society in their various shapes and forms, (class of) slaves as serfs or wage labourers, in accordance with the usufruct which the ruling class has prescribed for the ruled class.

When Marxism has given economic conception to the class as arising from the possession and non-possession of the means of production, it was but natural for it to hold the belief that the class-structure of the society was founded on an economic basis inasmuch as this results from its concept of class itself.

Perhaps this point is one of the most obvious example of analytical points of Marxism, as it is avid of putting on all social significances the economic interpretation and grafting upon them of particular economic value; and it has discharged this function with efficiency.

But the acumen in analysis on theoretical view has put upon Marxism the task of parting away with the real logic of history and the nature of things not as they reveal themselves or follow in succession in the mind of Marxist scholars but as they reveal themselves in the reality, inasmuch as while the Marxist analysis postulates the economic fact — the possession of the means of production and the non-possession of it — is the real and historical

basis of the class- structure and the social division of ruling class— because it does possess and the ruled class, because it does not possess —the historical reality and the logic of event demonstrate on many occasions the contrary and make it clear that it is the statutes of classes which is the cause of the economic formation by which these classes are distinguished. Thus the economic form of a class is determined by her class entity and not that her class entity is the result of her economic formation.

And the greatest conjuncture is that when Marxism decided that the class-structure is founded on the economic basis, and when it laid stress upon the fact that the class is the result as to the possession, it did not reach the result which should have resulted logically from it; and that result was the activity in the working fields is the only procedure of achieving social status and the creation of an upper class in society. For if the class creation of the upper ruling class in the society were the result of the possession — economic formation — then the creation of this ownership was invariably necessary for it to become a ruling upper class, and there was no way of acquiring it except through the activity in the fields of labour. This might be the oddest result the Marxist analysis chums up, on account of its interval from reality; and if not, then when was activity in the fields of work the basic way of the formation of the ruling class in the society? And if this result, which follows logically from the Marxist analysis, were applied to the historical period, it can be only applied to the capitalist society in its formative and completionary period; so as to make it possible for anyone to say that the capitalist class built up its class entity by way of ownership it acquired through its indefatigable activity in the field of work and production. As for the other historical circumstances it was neither the practical activity the basis of the creation of the class nor was the chief pillar of the ruling class during all the ages. On the contrary, the state of ownership made

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

often its appearance as a result of the formation of the class, and not as the basis of it.

If that were not so, how are we going to explain the demarcation lines set up, in the Roman society between its nobility and laity, consisting of the class of businessmen who approached nobility in the possession of fortunes and enjoyed the properties not less than those of nobles, yet there was great difference between them as to their social status and of the special political powers by which the nobles were distinguished from the businessmen and other groups? !

And how are we to explain the existing of the class of Samurai enjoying great privilege and in the ancient Japanese society, which comes in the social hierarchy, immediately next to the feudal lords, and which for its class-formation relies upon its swordsmanship and horsemanship; not upon its ownership and its economic values.

And how are we to explain of the caste-system of social order in the Indian society by the Veda-Aryans who invaded India, over two thousand years ago, became the rulers of the country and established therein class social order, based on blood and colour, and then the class formation developed, that the ruling-invador-class divided into castes the victor class becoming shatriya (warrior caste) on account of its military competency and fighting skill, and the Brahman caste, which was founded on the basis of religion (the priestly caste) and the all of the remaining groups consisting of merchants, and artisans and who owned the means of production, were subordinate to these two former classes. And the aborigines (the original inhabitants of the country) who held fast to their religion, occupied the lowest position in the caste-hierarchy, form the class of untouchables (shurdru). So neither the possession of property had influence in this class formation established on the military, religious and racial basis and has continued to exercise for

centuries its social function in the land of India, nor did the possession of means of production help the merchants and the artisans to raise them up to the rank of the ruling class or to compete with these classes for the political or religious powers.

And lastly, how are we to explain the establishment of the feudal order in the Western Europe as a result of the Germanic conquest if we were not to explain it militarily and politically. We all know – and even Engels himself used to recognise it that the social position of the victorious leader of whom this class was formed, was not the result of their possession of feudal property followed from their social rank and their particular military and political privilege as victorious invaders who had entered a vast land and had divided it between them. Hence the ownership of the land was the effect not the effective factor.

In this way we find non Marxist elements, and conclude to non-Marxist results on their analysis about many of the class-structures of various human societies.

In this respect Marxism can try to defend its class conception by holding out the view of the reciprocal relation between the economic factor and various other social factors – a matter which cause it to be influenced by them and shape itself in accordance with; just as it influences them and takes its share in their formation.

However, this attempt itself is sufficient to demolish the historical materialism and to pronounce a death decree against its giants scientific of glory held in the Marxist world; that it thereby becomes an explanation of history like many other explanations differing from them only in its emphasis on the economic factor as being more important in comparatively along with its acknowledgement of these other root factors taking part in the making of history.

If Marxism has been mistaken in making the economic formation as the sole cause of class formation, then we come to

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

learn from this that it had been mistaken also in giving it a purely economic conception. For if the class is not always established on an economic basis in its social-structure, then it will not be correct for us to regard class as the pure expression of a definite economic value as Marxism claims to be, a matter that has made it reach strange analogous results to which its view led her in accounting for the formation of the class, and the justification of their results. We saw that when Marxism held that a class is formed only in accordance with the economic conditions and the state of ownership, this obliged her to say that the activity in the field of labour is the only way of attaining to social elevation. Likewise it is possible for us to observe now that if we give the class its Marxist conception, or rather its pure economic conception which says that a group which lives upon its labour forms one class and a group which lives upon the exploitation of the means of production which it owns forms another class, and do not put any other consideration into the conception of class, except these economic values just as Marxism insists upon it, its meaning surely would be that we will be registering the great physicians, engineers, managers of commercial foundations and great companies into the same class which consists of the mine-workers, the agricultural and industrial wage-labourers, for they are all wage-earners, while it will be necessary for us to put a boundary class limit between these wage-earners, and the owners of the means of production irrespective of whatever be the amount of the wages of the former and whatsoever be the nature of the abundant means of the production of the latter. Inasmuch as struggle between classes is Marxist coinage that it is unavoidable by the classes, it will then give us a picture in which we will see the members of the class of owners of the small means of production standing on their class-struggle by the side of the exploiting class proprietors while the highly wage earning among engineers and medical specialist

standing by the side of the exploited toilers. And thus the manager of a big business enterprise will change into a wielding worker who rushes himself into a battle against the exploiting properties, as a result of incorporation of the social facts into the economic values, and of assuming of the economic apparatus as the basic factor in the income distribution of the social classes.

We draw two important conclusions from our examination of this Marxist analysis of class concept.

First of them is that the establishment of classes in a society after the legal annulment of the private property is possible, since the state of proprietorship, as we have learnt, is not the sole basis for the formation of class, and this is the result which Marxism dreaded when it laid stress on the point of the state of proprietorship as being the sole cause of the existence of the classes, in order to establish in this way the need of the decline of the class and the impossibility of its existence in the socialist society wherein private property shall be abolished. So long as it is made clear to us that the private property in its legal form is not the only cause of the existence of the social class, we may cast aside this evidence, and it will become possible to find class in one or other form in the socialist (communist) society itself as it is formed in other societies. We shall, God willing, examine more comprehensively this point at our criticism of the socialist phase of the historical materialism.

And the second conclusion is that the (class) conflict wherever found in the society does not necessarily reflect the economic values by the apparatus of distribution in the society, for, it is neither the nature of the economic side of income being in the form of wage or profit, imposes the conflict nor are the confrontations of the conflict being divided on the basis of these revenues and the economic values.

4- PHYSICAL FACTORS AND MARXISM

One of the aspects of the outstanding defects of Marxist hypothesis is its seeming obliviousness of the physiological, psychological and physical factors and the neglect of their role in history. Despite of the fact that at times they exercise great influence in the life of the society and its general state, inasmuch as it is these factors which determine the operational trends of the individual, his particular propensities and his competencies in conformity with the physiological constitution he is endowed with. These trends, compassions and competencies differ from individuals in accordance with those factors and take part in the making of history, setting up dissimilar positive roles in the life of society.

We all know the historical role which the military talents of Napoleon and his exceptional valour played in the life of Europe.

We all know the unstableness (bloom) of Louis XV and its effect on the seven years war in which France fought on the side of Austria. It was a single woman, like Madame of Pompadour, who was able to possess the will of the king and consequently to drive France to alliance with Austria in the war and to bear the burden of the unpleasant consequence, it was faced with.

We all know the historical role which the episode of the special love of as that of the English King, Henry played, resulting in the renouncement of the Catholic creed by the Royal family and subsequently by the English people.

We all know what parental love did, which drove Mu`āwiyah son of Abi Sufyān to the adoption of all the possible methods to obtain oath of allegiance for his son, Yazid. A matter which explains a decisive shift in the general political course of his time.

Would the history have ended in the same way it did practically had not Napoleon been a strong willed military man

or had Louis not been a weak-willed monarch ruled by his mistresses or had Henry not fallen in love of Anne Boleyn or had not a particular sentiment held sway over the heart of Mu`âwiyah the son of Abu Sufyân?

And does no one know what would have happened had not the natural conditions permitted the epidemic sweeping away the whole vicinity of Roman Empire and the sucking up hundreds of thousands of their inhabitants, which helped its collapse and change the general facade of history?

And also does no one know what direction the ancient history would have taken, had not a Macedonian soldier saved the life of Alexander in the nick of time, by chopping off the hand that fell down on him from behind while he was on his way to a momentous military conquest, the effect of which was extended to the passing of generations and centuries?

If these qualities of steadiness and bloom of love and sentiment were themselves effective in the history and of the cause of social events, then can we possibly explain them on the basis of the productive forces and (socio) economic formations so as to bring them once again to the economic factors in which Marxism believes?

The fact is that no one will have any doubt in that these qualities cannot be explained on the basis of economic factors and the productive forces. For example, it was not the means of production and the economic conditions which formed the special temperament of the King Louis XV. On the contrary had natural and psychological conditions helped, Louis could have been a man of strong will power like Louis XIV or like Napoleon for instance. His particular temperament originated from the physical characteristic, physiological and mental qualities of which his specific constitutional existence and his distinctive personality form.

Marxism would hasten to say here; was it not the social

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

relations which the economic factor had generated in the French society that had fixed up the form of the hereditary monarchical rule which permitted Louis to influence upon the history and to reflect his bloom character upon the military and historical events. For, in fact, the role which this king played was only the result of this system which in its turn was begotten of the economic formation and the forces of production; or else who can say that Louis would have been able to influence in the history had he not been a monarch and France had not acknowledged the system of the rule of hereditary monarchy. (Plekhanov: *The Role of the Individual in History* [Arabic transl.], p.68).

This is quite true. Had Louis not been a monarch, his magnitude would have been negligible in the accounting of history. But we say from the other side; Had Louis been a monarch enjoying inflexibly strong personality and resolute will, the historical role which he played would have been certainly different and consequently the military and political events in France would have been different. Then what was that factor which deprived him of the strength of personality and denied him of resolute will? Was it the Royal system of government or the physical factors which had a share in his physiological constitution and his particular formation?

In other words, there are three suppositions possible; any one of which would have been found in France, a presidential political authority, a monarchical authority with a weak willed ruler and a monarchical authority with an iron willed ruler.

Each one of these three suppositions has its particular effect on the course of the political and military events, and consequently in the formation of France at a particular interval of time. Let us elucidate the signification of the laws of history which Marxism has disclosed and on the basis of which it has explained history in terms of economic factor.

These laws point to the fact that the economic formation did not permit the establishment of the presidential authority in France, rather it imposes a monarchical form of government. Let us take it for granted as true. So it is not but only one side of the question because we are able to eliminate from it the first supposition, but the two other suppositions remain intact. Then is there any scientific law which makes inevitable the existence of a weak willed or strong willed ruler at that particular interval of the history of France, except the scientific laws of the physics of physiology and of psychology which explain the personality and the particular temperament of Louis??

Thus, we learn that individuals have their roles in history which are determined for them by the natural and psychological factors and not by the forces of production ruling in the society.

These historical roles which individuals play in accordance with their particular formation are not always secondary roles in the process of history as claimed by the great Marxist writer, Plekhanov when he asserts:

The personal qualities of leading people determine the individual features of historical events and the accidental factors (elements) ... and plays some role in the course of these events the trends of which are determined in the end (last analysis) by the so-called general laws, that is, by the development of the productive forces and their relations between men ... (*The Role of the Individual in History*, p.93).

We do not want to comment on this assertion made by Plekhanov, except to cite a single instance in the light of which we can understand. How the role played by an individual can become the cause of decisively turning the course of the direction of history? What would have been the fate of the direction of the world history had the atomist scientist of Nazi Germany been a few months ahead in discovering the secret of the atom? Had not Hitler's coming into possession of this secret been a guarantee for

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the change of the direction of history and collapse of capitalist democracy and Marxist socialism in Europe? Then why was Hitler not able to come into possession of this secret? Naturally it was not so because of the economic formation and the kind of the productive forces; It was so because scientific thought was not able to discover at that moment, the secret which was uncovered only a few months later, in conformity with physiological and psychological conditions.

Or rather what would possibly have happened, had not the Russian scientists achieved the secret of the atom? Was it not a possibility that the capitalist camp would have made use of the power of the atom at that moment in annihilation of socialist governments? In what terms would we explain Russian scientists discovery of the secret (of the atom) which saved the world of socialism from destruction?! We cannot say it was the productive forces which lifted the curtain from this secret. If so then why was it that only a few persons among a large number of scientists who were pursuing the atomic experiment, were able to dawn upon it?! This explains clearly that the discovery was indebted in a certain way, to the particular physiological structure and its mental conditions. Had these conditions been not realized in the person of one or a few scientists in Russia and a particular scientific talent consolidated, due to this structure and by those conditions socialism would have been stricken by destruction and routing in despite of all of laws of historical materialism.

And if it is possible to find moments in the human life which determine the issue of history or the nature of social events then how can it be taken that it is the laws of productive means which are the inevitable laws of history?!

5- AESTHETIC TASTE AND MARXISM

Man's aesthetic taste — as a social phenomenal expression

in which all societies share according to difference between them as to their system, relations and productive means — is another category of social truths which disturb historical materialism as we shall see.

The discourse on the aesthetic art has various sides. When an artist paints an admirable portrait of a great political leader or depicts an exquisite picture of the scene of a battle campaign, we may ask on one time about the method which the artist followed in painting the picture and the nature of the means and materials employed by him and on the second time, we may ask about his motive behind painting of this picture and on the third time, we may ask why do we admire it, why our feelings are filled with admiration of it and why we enjoy the seeing of it?

Marxism can answer the 'first question by saying that the method which the artist followed during the process of his painting was the method which the degree of the development of the means of production and the productive forces prescribed for him; so it is the natural means which fix the method of painting.

Likewise, Marxism can answer the second question by assuming that art is always employed in the service of the ruling class. Thus the motive which invites artists to artistic invention and artifices is to strengthen this class and its interest and as this class is begotten of the productive forces so the means of production is the last answer to this other question.

But what will Marxism do with the third question? Why do we admire and enjoy a picture?? Was it the productive forces or class interest which generated this admiration in our hearts or does this aesthetic taste, or is it internal consciousness which emanate from the depth of the heart and does not proceed from the means of productions and their class-conditions?

Historical materialism obliges Marxism to explain aesthetic taste in terms of the forces of production and the class-interest,

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

for according to historical materialism it is the economic factor which explains all the social phenomenon. But it will not be able to do that even if it tried, for if it were the productive forces and the class interest which create this artistic taste, it would have declined with their decline, and the artistic taste would have developed following the development of the means of production, in the same way as all the manifestations and the social relations. But the fact is that in spite of the development of the means of production and the social relations the ancient art with its exquisite marvels had not ceased even to this day in the human view to be the source of aesthetic pleasure of the beauty and continues to fascinate and fill their heart with delight even in this atomic age as it has done for thousand of years ago. Then how was it that this spiritual delight has continued so that it has caused the men of capitalism and socialism to enjoy the art of the slave society as the lords and the slaves were enjoying it?! And by which potent faculty that had the power to free the artistic taste from the fetters of historical materialism and eternalize it in the mind of man?! Is it not the original human element which is the only explanation that answers this question?!

Here Marx tries to bring about reconciliation between the laws of historical materialism and the admiration for the ancient art by claiming:

Modern man enjoys with admiration of the ancient art as representing the infancy of the human species in the same way as it gives pleasure to all men to review the accounts of his early childhood pure and free from entanglements.(Karl Marx, p.243).

But Marx does not say anything about the delights of men at the accounts of their childhood as to whether they were due to a tendency of man's original disposition or a manifestation subject to the economic factor and changeable with its change!!

Then why is it that modern man finds pleasure and

fascination in admirable pieces of Greek arts, for instance, while does not find such pleasure and such fascination in the accounts of other phenomena of their life, such as their thoughts, their habits and their early customs when all these too represent the infancy of the homo sapiens?!

And what does Marxism say about those pure natural scenes which from the remotest period of history and still are capable of satisfying man's aesthetic sense and of sending transport of delight to his soul?! Why do we find pleasure in these scenes as just as do the masters and slaves, feudalists and the serfs, in despite of the fact that they do not represent anything of the infancy of the homo sapiens; the basis of which Marx explains our admiration of the ancient art!

Do we not learn from this that the question is not a question of our admiration of the pictures of childhood but is a question of the original general aesthetic taste which makes man of the slave-age and the man of the age of freedom, having the same internal consciousness of it!!

And at the conclusion of our this study of the theory as to its general essence, may we not find it natural that Engels, the second founder of the historical materialism, expressing regret as to his having exaggerated the role of the economic factor, and to acknowledge that he, with his friend Marx, had both been at fault in defending the essence of their doctrine in respect of their conception of the historical materialism? For Engels in his letter (1890) to Joseph Bloch wrote:

Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger authors sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasise the main principles vis-à-vis our adversaries who denied it. And we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to give their due to the other elements involved in the interaction. (Engels: *The Socialist Interpretation of History*, p.116).

IV- THE THEORY WITH ITS DETAILS

When we undertake the study and close investigation of the details of the theory, we should begin with the first stage of the journey of history — primitive communism in the opinion of Marxism; since according to Marxist belief, humanity has passed through a stage of primitive communism at the dawn of its social life. This stage was carrying in its folds its antithesis in accordance with the laws of dialectics. After a long struggle it grew and became violent to such a degree that the communist system of the society and the antithesis emerged triumphant in a new garb, the slavery system and the serfdom society in the place of the communal system and the equalitarian society.

WAS THERE A COMMUNIST SOCIETY?

Before we fully grasp the details of this stage the basic question obstructs the investigation; what is a scientific evidence as to whether humanity has actually passed through a stage of primitive communism? Or rather how to obtain this scientific evidence, while we are speaking about humanity before the ages of transmitted history? Marxism has endeavoured to overcome this difficulty and to offer a scientific evidence according to the

soundness of its understanding of that obscure phase of the human social life by resting its case on the observation of a number of contemporary societies which Marxism has judged as primitive, and which it has considered as a scientific material of investigation for what was the pre-historic age as representative of the social infancy and expressive of the very self-same primitive condition through which human societies have generally passed. Since Marxist knowledge about these contemporary primitive societies confirms corroboratively that primitive communism is the ruling condition there, so it must be the first (primary) stage of all the primitive societies in the dark ages of history. As a result of that it appeared to Marxism to have come into possession of the tangible maternal evidence.

But we should know fact – before everything – that Marxism did not receive its information about these contemporary primitive societies directly but obtained them through individuals who chanced to go to these societies, and to become acquainted with their characteristics. Not this only but also it took in to account only such information as agreed with its general theory and accused every information which conflicted with it of distortion and falsification. Thus Marxist investigation tended towards selection of information favourable to the theory and arbitration to the theory itself in the consideration of the value of the information and reports about those societies, instead of the information arbitrament of the theory and the examination of the theory in the light of them. In this convection we may lend ear to the great Marxist writer saying:

And howsoever deep we may penetrate into the past we find men was living in societies. And what make the study of these ancient societies easy, is that the existence of these primitive social systems wherein the same primitive condition even to this day prevail; like most of the tribes in Africa, Polynesia Malinisa Australia, American Indians

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

before the discovery of the continent, Eskimos, Lagoons, etc... . and most of the many information which have reached us about these aboriginal societies are presented to us by the men of missionary expeditions who have distorted the facts intentionally or unintentionally. (*The Fundamental Principals of Capitalist Economy*, p.10).

Let us admit that the information upon which Marxism relies are the only authentic ones, then it will be our right to ask about these societies; Are they primitive on which we may rely upon about the picture of the social primitiveness? In relation to this new question, Marxism does not possess a single evidence of the primitiveness of these contemporary societies in the scientific sense of the word. On the contrary the law of the inevitable of the evolution of history, in which Marxism believes, demands that the process of the social evolution decisively prevails in these societies. Therefore when Marxism claims that the actual condition of these societies is their primitive condition, then it nullifies the laws of evolution and establishes inertia through passage of thousands of years.

HOW WE INTERPRET PRIMITIVE COMMUNISM

We will leave this to see how Marxism explains the so called stage of communism in accordance with the laws of historical materialism.

Marxism explains relations of communist property in the primitive society of human beings by the primitive stage on which the forces of production were at that time and the prevailing conditions of production. Human beings were obliged to pursue production a jointly social form and unblock (in group) to face the nature, due to man's weakness and paucity of means. Cooperation in production necessitates the establishment of communal property and forbids the thought of private ownership.

Therefore, the property will be a communal property because the production is communal production; and the distribution among individuals would also be on the basis of equality because of the conditions of the production. For the severe low level of the forces of production rendered distribution of meagre food and simple commodities in equal portion obligatory. Establishment of any other mode of distribution was impossible, because anyone of the individuals acquiring a share exceeding the share of other individuals would lead to the later person's starving. (*Evolution of Private Property*, p.14).

In this manner Marxism explains the communism of the primitive society and interpret the causes of equality therein prevailing about which Morgan speaks in connection with the description of the primitive tribes which he witnessed living in the plains of North American and saw them distributing animal flesh in equal portions allotted to every individual of the tribe.

Marxism says this, while at the very time it is contradicting, when it talks about the morals dispositions of the communist society and glorifies its virtues. It cites on the authority of James Andererz, who studied American Indians in the last century; that these primitive groups regarded not rendering assistance to one who needed it as a great crime and regarded with scorn and contempt the perpetrator of it. He cites on the authority of Catalin that every individual of an Indian village (settlement be he man, woman or child) has the right to enter any dwelling and eat if he is hungry; nay those who were disabled for work or whom sheer laziness from hunting were able, in spite of that to enter any house they want and share food with its inmates. Thereby an individual obtained food in these societies, no matter how much he eluded his obligations as regards to the production of this food and nothing may result by his desertion except his own feeling towards a remarkable losing of his dignity. (*Evolution of Private Property*, p.18).

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

These knowledges which Marxism presents to us about the morals of primitive communist societies and their socially adhered customs, and clarifies that the level of productive forces was not low to a degree which would mean the exceeding any one individual's share from product would result in the starving of another individual; but existed in abundance from which the decrepit and the helpless and others would obtain something. In such a case, why an equal distribution was the only possible mode?! Or how did not occur to anyone the idea of exploitation and of fraudulence to distribution in respect of product so long as there was abundance making possible exploitation? ! If the forces of production permitted exploitation in these societies we should find the reason for non-appearance of it, titled to the degree of consciousness of the primitive man and his practical idea. Indeed, the idea of the exploitation come to him as a belated manifestation of this consciousness and practical idea and as a product of his progress and the increase of human familiarity with life.

However, if it were possible for Marxism to say — or was it possible for us to say from our point of view — that the mode of equal distribution came in the beginning, following from scarcity of product then it took root and became a habit, would we find therein a reasonable explanation of the attribute of the primitive society as regard the idle individuals who were giving up work intentionally and voluntarily, yet fading their sufficiency out of the production of others without being threatened with danger of hunger and deprivation? ! Does social participation in the process of production impose the distribution of the product to the non-participants in the production too?! If the primitives were intent, in the beginning upon the mode of equal distribution lest anyone dying of hunger they would thereby loose a helper vis-à-vis the operation of social production, then why did they endeavour to support the idlers by those loss they lose nothing?!

WHAT IS THE ANTITHESIS OF (THE PRIMITIVE) COMMUNIST SOCIETY?

Indeed, the primitive communist society was, in the opinion of Marxism concealing in its bowels a conflict ever since it was born. This conflict began to grow and became stronger till it exterminated this society. It was not a class conflict because primitive society was a single class and there did not exist two classes in conflict with each other. It was only a conflict between the communist relations of property and the forces of production when they began to grow to the degree that communist relations became a hindrance and an impediment to their progress and with that production will be in need of new relations in which its growth continues.

But how and why the communist relations become a hindrance and an impediment for the forces of production to their growth? This is what Marxism explains it. The evolution of the forces of production put within power of an individual to succeed from his work of raising of livestock and crop, in obtaining means of livelihood in excess of what he needs for the preservation of his life. Thereby the individual was able to meet his requirement by labour of a limited portion of time for the nourishment of himself without spending all his operational energy. It was therefore, new social force, inevitable to create in order to mobilize all practical aptitudes for the benefit of production, as the productive forces would necessitate for their development and growth a new social force, which would constrain the producers to spend all their aptitudes; and since in the communistic relations this aptitude is not found it became necessary to replace these relations by the slavery system which would enable the lords to course the slave uninterrupted labour. Thus the slave order sprang up.

Indeed, the slavery system began, at the start, by the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

enslavement of war prisoners which the tribe used to gain from its forays (raids). Formerly, they were accustomed to kill them because they had not found advantage in preserving and feeding of them. After the evolution of production their preservation and enslavement was to the interest of the tribe for what they produced was more than what they consumed. In this way the prisoners of war were converted into slaves; And as a result of the wealth of those who employ slaves, these rich people began to enslave even the members of their own tribe. Thus the society was broken up into the class of masters and class of slaves. The production was able to continue its evolution through this class division, due to the new slave order.

If we examine this closely, we would be able to see clearly through the Marxist explanation itself, that the matter is a matter of man before it is a matter of the means of production, because the increase of the productive forces demanded only more human labour, and the social character of labour has no relation with its increase, for just as the abundant slave labour increases production, so, does the abundant free labour. Therefore, if the individuals of the society, collectively decided upon multiplying their efforts in production and upon distribution of the product equally, they would have ensured thereby the growth of the productive forces which was achieved by the slave society, rather the production would have surely increased quantitatively and typically more than it would have grown by the pursuit of the slaves, because the slave labours disheartenedly and does not try to think or acquire experience for the sake of improving production, in contrast to the freemen, who are solidary in working.

By then the growing of productive forces was not conditioned on the slavery character of labour. Therefore why did the social man multiply the labour by the method of conversion half of the society into slaves, and did not realise it by the method of free mutual agreement – between all – towards

multiplying labour?! We will not find answer to this question except from the man himself and from his physical tendencies. The man is, by nature, favourably disposed to economise in labour and to follow the easiest way to his goal. As soon he faces two ways to achieve one aim, he will surely choose the less difficult. This original trend of a man is not a result of the means of production, but is a product of his own physical composition. That is why this trend remained constant in despite the evolution of production through thousands of years, as well it is not a product of the society; but the formation of the society was due to this natural tendency of human being as he noticed that the formation of blocs is the least way in difficult to resist against the nature and to exploit it.

This physical trend is the one which inspired to man the thought of enslaving others as a method offering better guarantee and less charging for his leisure.

Therefore, the force of production was neither the one created for a social man the slavery system, nor did it push him into it. But it arranged for him the adequate circumstances to go in accordance with his natural trend. This case is similar to some-one giving a sword to a person who by relieving his resentment kills his enemy with it. Thereby we cannot interpret this killing incident by only the basis of the sabre, but we do it (before that) in the light of the personal feelings which preoccupy the heart of the killer; for offering the sword did not push him to perpetration of the crime had it not been those feelings which introverted him to the crime.

In this respect, we see that Marxism assumes a silence towards another reason which would have naturally had its great effect in annihilation of the communism and in evaluation of the society into masters and slaves. That is what the communism tended to recline the great number of the individuals of the society to the equanimity, laziness and abstention from contin-

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

uation and expansion of production; so that Losskyl wrote about some Indian tribes (in America) (they are so lazy that they do not cultivate anything by themselves, rather they totally depend on the expectation that other person will never refuse to share with him in his product. Since by them the active was not more enjoying the profit of the fruits of his work, than does the sluggish, their production was diminishing every year).

Marxism, then does not mention these complication of the primitive communism, as elements towards its failure and disappearance from the scene of history and towards undertaking by the energetic individuals of enslaving the lazy ones and employing them by force in the fields of production.

This is perfectly an understood position of Marxism; for they do not recognise the complete idleness and inactivity which resulted from communism. Because this asides us to comprehend the original disease of Marxism which makes it unfit to the human being, in accordance with his special psychological and physiological constitution which is found in his frame since the dawn of life. This also demonstrates the communism is not suitable to the human nature. And accordingly it proves that all similar complications happened during the recent revolution in Russia in trying to fully applying the communism, was not a result of class thoughts and a dominating capitalist mental in the society — as the Marxists claim — but it was an expression of the human reality, his self motives and feelings which were created with him before the begetting of class, its contradictions and thoughts.

THE SLAVERY SOCIETY

The second stage of historical materialism begins with the changing of society from primitive communism to slavery order. By its start, the class is begotten in the society, and the con-

tradiction raises between the class of masters and the class of slaves; a matter which threw the society into the oven of class struggle for the first time in history. This struggle is still existing up today with different forms, following the nature of productive forces and their requirements.

We must here raise the question in the immediate presence of Marxism about this partitioning division of the life of humanity which divided into two classes, masters and slaves, and how therein those ones were not with mastery and those (other) ones were fated to slavery and bondage, and why did not masters pledge to part of slaves and slaves the part of masters.

Marxist reply to this question is ready, it states that both of the masters and slave represent an inevitable role which the economic factor and the logic of production imposes because the class which represents the role of masters in the society, was relatively on a higher load of wealth, and was possessing, on account of this, of binding others by it in band of band and slavery and bondage but the enigma (mystery) remains in spite of this reply — remains as it was, unchanged because we know that these relatively (comparatively) inflated localities did not fall to these masters as a boll from the blue. Then how those ones acquired them without the others acquiring those while and were able to impose their mastery over others not withstanding all living in one communal society.

Marxism replies to this fresh question by two things:

One of them is, the individuals who were pursuing function of the leaders, senior war officers and the priests, in a primitive communist society took to exploiting their position in order to obtain wealth and to acquire a portion of public (common) property and began to secede gradually slowly from the members of their societies to be formed into aristocracy while the members of the society began to suffer slowly devolution under their economic dependence. (*Evolution of Individual Property*, p.32).

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

The second that thing which helped towards the creation of difference and inconsistency in regard to the level of production and wealth among the individuals of the society; that the society converted the prisoners of war into slaves and began to gain on account of it surplus product (product more than their necessary wants, till it became rich and was able, as a result of its wealth, to enslave those members of the tribe, who were stripped of their possessions (*amwāl*) and had become debtors (*ibid.*, p.33).

Both these things do not agree with the view point of the historical materialism. The first, because it leads to regarding political factor as a main and the economic factor as a minor factor arising from it because it assumes that it was the political position which the leaders, priest and the chiefs enjoy in the class-less communist society, that opened its way path to enrichment and the creation of private property. Therefore the phenomenon of classifications was a product of political nature, not the reverse as the historical materialism declares. As for the second cause by which Marxism has explained the difference of wealth, well, it only advances one step towards the solution of the problem in view of the fact it regards the masters' taking as slaves the sons of the tribe is anteceded by masters enslavement of the prisoners of war and their enrichment on account of these war-prisoners. But why those masters were provided with the opportunity of the enslavement of the war-prisoners was provided to them of all the members without providing of it to any other member then there Marxism will not try to give explanation of this because it will not find its explanation according to forces of production but his explanation may be a humanly explanation of it which could be given on the basis of diverse differentials and competencies bodily, intellectual and military, which man occasions. They differ in the shares of them in accordance with their psychological physiological, physical circumstances and conditions.

THE FEUDAL SOCIETY

The feudal society arose after that as a result of the contradictions which were acting upon (governing) the slave society and on the basis of these contradiction, the rivalry between the relations of social order (system) and the growth of productive forces, since these relations, after a long intervals of time in the life of the slave society became an impediment to the growth of production and obstacle in its path from two directions:

One that it opened before the masters as productive force a scope for the brutal exploitation of the slaves on account of this thousands of slaves collapsed in the field of actively — a matter which cost a great loss of productive force presenting itself in the form of these slaves.

The other: These relations converted gradually a majority of the independent farmers and independent craftsman into slaves. Therefore the society lost — on account of that — armed forces and soldiers of freemen through whose continuous and successive raids the society used to obtain an uninterrupted flow of productive slaves. Thus the slave order (system) resulted within the designation internal productive forces and in the in-ability of the procurative (importation) of fresh productive forces via road captivation. Because of that a violent conflict arose between it and the forces of production, the slave society collapsed (was demolished) and the feudal order succeeded (replaced) it.

In this presentation Marxism ignored a several essential points pertaining to the subject matter.

Firstly: the transformation of the Roman society from slave order to feudal order was not a revolutionary transformation busting forth from the class of the ruled as is assumed by the dialectical logic of the historical materialism.

Secondly: that not any evolution whatever the productive forces had preceded social and economic transformation as

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

requires the Marxist assumption establish on the basis of it that it is the means (modes) of production the supreme motive force of history.

Thirdly: that the economic formation which is the basis, is the opinion of Marxism, of the social formations was not, in its historical change, expressive of integrative phase (unifying to form a complete whole) of its history but is effected by its decadence (relapse) contrary to the concepts of the historical materialism which asserts that history always marches forward (advance forward) in all of its situation and that the economic formation is the vanguard of this constant (eternal) march advancement. We treat these three points in details.

A — The Transformation was not Revolutionary:

The transformation (conversion) of the Roman society, for instance, from slave owning system to feudal system was not the result of a class revolution at one of the partitioning moments of history in spite of the fact revolution is the inevitable laws of historical materialism for all the social changes (transformations) in accordance to the dialectical law (the law of the jumps of evolution) which holds that gradual quantitative changes are transformed all at once into qualitative change. In this way was rendered in-operative this dialectical law and did not effect the transformation of the slave owning society into feudal society in a periodical revolutionary shape immediately, the society was according to clarification of Marxism itself, transformed through the masters themselves since they took to emancipating a great portion of their slaves, dividing many land establishes into small portion and giving it to them after they felt that the slave owning system did not insure their interest. (*Evolution of Individual Property*, p.53).

Then, in that case it was the master class which in fact had transformed the society gradually into feudal system without needing any need of the law of class revolution or jumps of

evolution . . . The other external factor was the invasion of the Teutonic (Germanic) tribes, and the creation of feudalism, according to the admission of Marxism itself; and such phenomenon, in its turn, is inconsistent with those laws.

It is curious, that the revolutions which should, according to historical materialism, have erupted (burst out) at the moment of the partitioning change, we find in fact they had broken out centuries before the collapse of slave owning society like the (freedom) movement of the slaves in sports four centuries before Christ, in which thousands of slaves, collected near the city and tried to storm it. The (Spartan) leaders were compelled to seek military assistance (support) from their neighbours and were to repel the rebel slaves only after a number of years. Likewise the slave rising of slaves about seventy years B. C. in Roman Empire in which were massed terms of thousands of slaves and had nearly put to end the existence of the empire. This uprising was preceded by a number of centuries of the rise of feudal society. It let it not find and intensify contradictions between (social) relations and forces of production but was deriving its facts from steadily increasing feeling of oppressions and massive military, leaderly, power which that feeling erupted in spite of the means of production which were in harmony with the slave owning system, so it is wrong to explain every revolution on the basis of a fixed (definite) evolution of production or as a social expression of a need of the productive forces.

Let us compare — after these between the frightful revolutions which the slaves had launched against the slave owning system, before leaving the field (to proceed) towards feudal system by a number of centuries and what Engels has written, holding:

So long as any mode of production continues describing the ascending steps (curves) of development, it is received with enthusiasm and well-come even by those whose lot is made worse by the cause of its corresponding mode of distribu-

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

tion. (Engels: *Anti Dühring*, vol.II, p.9).

How would we explain these revolts of the slaves which proceeded the switch over the scription of feudalism by six centuries in the narrow frame of this theory as far as revolutions. If the dissatisfaction of the oppressed grows constantly as an expression of the lighting upon (stumble upon) the method of production and note an expression of their mental or real condition they multitude (crowds) of the slaves then why these multitudes of slaves were dissatisfied and expressed their dissatisfaction in revolutionary term which the Roman Empire almost thoroughly before lighting upon the modes of production, standing on the basis of slave-owning system and (that) several centuries before having a historical need for its evolution.

B- Social Transformation did not proceed any Renewal of the Forces of Production:

Obviously Marxism believes that the forms of social relations are subsidiary to (dependent upon) the forms of production. There-fore, every form of production calls for a particular form of social collective property and these relations cannot develop unless they are followed with the change of productive form and its forces.

No social formation ever dies before the productive forces evolve which can make room for it. (Marx: *Philosophy of History*, [Arabic transl.] p.47).

While Marxism asserts this, we find the form of production in the slave-owning society and feudal society was one at the same time with each other, and the servile relations did not change into feudal relations as a result of any development or renovation of the dominant productive forces which had not transcended the scopes of hand forming and manual labour. This means that the social formation and servile formation may

have perhaps become extinct before the productive forces develop contrary to the above mentioned assertion of Marx.

Counter to this we find by the admission of Marxism itself that the number of productive forces has marked numerous forms and diverse grades of production during thousands of years without effecting any change in the social entity. The primitive man used to take help of the stones in their natural form for his productive activity then he resorted for help to stone implements. Thereafter he was able to discover fire and to make axe (hatchet) and lances and bayonets. Thereafter, the forces of production developed and the mining implements and bows and arrows made their appearance. Later on farming product emerged in the life of man and after that animal product. Indeed these great transformations of the modes of production were completed and formed on uninterrupted sequence of its developments, we have mentioned or with other sequences without their accompanying the social transformation and the changes of the common relations, by the admission of Marxism itself, since it believes the system dominant prevalent in primitive society in which all these changes (developments) took place was a primitive community society.

If, therefore, it may have been possible that the models of production change while the social form remains unchanged (firmly fixed) as in the primitive society, for instance; and if it have been that the former of the society change while the modes of production remains fixed (is unchanged) as we observed in the case of slave-owning and feudal society then what is that need that calls upon the affirmation that every social formation is correlated to a definite mode and particular phase of production. Why should we not attribute to Marxism (make it say) what it did say that the social system is only the product, the sum total, of the scientific practical ideas which man acquires during his social try out (experience) of the relations he shares in with others. Likewise the modes of production are the result of the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

reflective and scientific ideas which man acquires during his natural experiment in regard of the forces of production and all of the forces of nature, since the natural experiments are relatively of short journey (they give their result in a relatively short interval of time) the modes of production evolve rapidly in contrast to the social experiments for it concerns the entire history of the society. Therefore the reflective and practical ideas do not grow during this slow try out with the same rapidity with which reflective and scientific ideas grow during the natural experiment try out. The case being such it is but natural that at the beginning the forms of the system will not evolve with the same rapidity the mode of production will evolve.

C- The Economic Situation had not Reached Perfection:

We have already previously mentioned that Marxism explains the decline of the slave-owning system by the fact that it has become an impediment to and incompatible with the growth of production, therefore it is necessary that the productive forces should remove it from its path and produce an economic mode which will participate with it as regards its growth and will not be incompatible with it. Is this rightly applicable to the historical matter of fact?

Were the feudal conditions and circumstances of the society slower of pace for the growth of production than the conditions and circumstances before that. And did the mode of production move along with the human Caravan – on the ascending line, as the movement of history requires it according to Marxists, who make it understand as a process of continuous unification of the whole of the historical content in accordance with the economic situation and growth?

Nothing of this thing took place in the supposed Marxism manner. For the realization of that it will be sufficient to cast a

look at the economic life the Roman Empire was living. It had reached — particularly a stated part of it — a high economic level and commercial capitalism had made a great advancement, and obviously commercial capitalism is an advanced economic form. When the Roman Empire practised this form as history indicates-it had attained to a relatively high stage of its economic structure and moved much away greatly from all kinds of primitive closed economics (home economics). As a result of it, it had spread to many of the states which were contemporaries of the Roman, due to the construction and safety of the roads, the safety of them and the production of the navigation, nothing to say of the internal trade which flourished all over the parts of the Roman Empire, between Italy and the provinces and between one province with the other. Even the earthen wares of Italy. They overran the worlds' market from Britain on the north to the shores of the Black Sea in the East and the safety-pins (Aukisa [?]) with which it was distinguished; and the lamps which the Italians produced in terrific quantities were found in every parts of the Empire.

The question which faces us in the light of these facts is, why did not the economic modes and commercial capitalism preserve in their course of growth and of their integration, so long as the integrative movement was an inevitable law of the economic and productive modes and why did not the commercial capitalism evolves into industrial capitalism as happened in the middle of the eighteenth (18th) century, so long as the merchants had with them capital in abundance while the people who had multiplied misery and poverty (event), were ready for the reference to the demand of the industrial capitalism for compliance with its desire? This means that the material conditions of the high social form were present. Therefore, if the material conditions were alone sufficient by themselves for the evolution of the tangible social fact, and if

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the forces of production during the course of their evolution always the shape of the modes which begin get going and within it and grow capitalism would have risen necessarily in the ancient history and would have fulfilled their requirement. Truly it would be logical that the industrial capitalism and its results which it had produced, should have emerged during the end part of the feudal era like the distribution of labour which lead to the emergence of the tools (machinery) during the industrial life.

The historical fact does not prove of the disappearance of it and the disconnection of the capitalism due to its growth, but also reveals clearly that the establishment of the feudal system (order) did away with the commercial capitalism, and finally throttled it to death in its cradle. Since it settled for every feudalism its particular limits and its closed economy established on the basis of its contentment with its agricultural revenues and its simple products. Therefore, it is but natural that commercial activity may fade out and commercial capitalism disappear and the poverty come back to semi-primitive economy like domestic economics.

Therefore was this economic situation with which the Roman society after the entrance of the Teutons, an explanation as regards historical growth and its lagging as regards the demand of production or a relapse foreign to historical material-ism, or an obstacle in path of material growth and the flourishing of economic life??!!

LASTLY THE CAPITALIST SOCIETY WAS FOUND

At last, the feudal society began to pass away, after it became a historical issue and an obstacle in the way of production, which necessitating a decisive solution, historical conditions had abraded mould the shape of this solution inclining to capitalism which had made its appearance on the social stage

to meet face to face the feudal system, as an historical antithesis of it, which grew under its shelter, so that when it completed its growth, it put an end to it, and won the battlefield . . . Marx describes us the growth of capitalist society in this way by saying:

The capitalist economic system has come out bowels of the feudalist economic system, and the disintegration (dissolution) of one of them leads to the emanation of the formative component of neat. (Karl Marx, sec.2, vol.iii, p.1053).

Since Marx starts analysing Capitalism historically, he attaches great importance to analyse what he calls 'Primary accumulation of capital'. This indeed is the first of the substantial points regarded essential for analysing the historical existence of Capital-ism. A new class having come into being in the society, on the crumbling down of the feudalism possessing capital and being able to hirelings in order to develop them, we must suppose special factors which led to a big accumulation of wealth in respect of the fortunes of a particular class and gathering of huge labour force which enabled that class to turn wealth into capitals and turn that labour force into paid hired servant who could carry on the operations of capital production on salary basis. So what are those factors and causes which afforded such a fortunate condition for that class, or to put it more appropriately wherein is the secret of the primary accumulation of capital on which was based the capitalist class vis-à-vis the class of hirelings?

While trying to analyse this point, Marx started with reviewing the conventional view point about political economy which says: The factor which enabled one particular class of society exclusively to obtain political conditions for capital production and the necessary wealth for the same, this class was characterised by the intelligence, frugality and good management and made it save something from its income, bit by bit, and treasure up the same gradually until it was able to secure a capital.

Marx has subjected this classical viewpoint to pungent ridi-

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

cule and great disparagement, as is usual with him in dealing with views he might be opposed to. Having ridiculed it, he remarks that treasuring only cannot account for the existence of capitalism. To find out the secret of the primary capital accumulation, on which was based the new class, we must examine the significance of the capitalist system itself and search in its depths, for the complicated secret.

Here Marx has recourse to his unique talent of expression and full command over words in order to apt up his point of view. He says: The capitalist system brings out to us a special kind of relationship between the capitalist who has means of production and the hireling who relinquishes, as the result of that relationship all proprietary rights to his production, only because he possesses nothing but a limited working power while the capitalist has all the necessary exterior provisions, material, implements and cost of living to incarnate that power. The position of the hireling in the capitalist system is therefore the result of his being devoid of and dissociated from the means of production which the capitalist enjoys. It means that the basis of capitalism is radical separation between the means of production and the hireling in spite of the fact that it is he who is the producer and who manages those means. So this separation is the essential condition historically, for the coming into existence of the capitalistic relations. Therefore, to bring about the capitalist system it is necessary, indisputably to actually seize the means of production from the producers — those producers who utilised them to carry out their particular work and these means of production must be confined to the hands of the capitalist traders. The historical movement which realises the separation between the producer and the means of production, confining these means to the hands of the traders is, therefore, the key to the secret of the primary capital accumulation. This historical movement was completed by means of enslavement, armed robbery, pillage and different forms of

violence, there being no hand in its realisation of planning, economy, intelligence and prudence as believed by authorities of the conventional political economy¹

We have a right to ask the question: Did Marx succeed in this explanation of his of the first accumulation which was the basis of the capitalist system? But before we answer this question we must know that while putting forward this explanation, Marx did not aim at condemning capitalism morally because it was based on extortion and pillage, although sometimes it appears that he was trying to do something like that. Because Marx regards capitalism, in the circumstance of its coming into being, as a movement forward which helped in leading man, through the historical winding, to the higher stage of human development. Thus, in his opinion, it agrees, in that circumstance, with moral values as according to him moral values are but an offspring of economic circumstances, needed by the means of production. As the production forces demanded the establishment of the capitalist system, it was but natural that the moral values be conditioned in that historical stage, in accordance with their demands.²

So it is not an aim of Marx — nor is it his right to aim, on the basis of his peculiar concepts at passing judgment on capitalism from the moral point of view. In his study of capitalism, he only aims at applying the historical materialism to the course of the historical development and analysing the events in accordance therewith. So, how far he has succeeded in this regard?

1. Vide, *Capital*, vol.iii, sec. 3, pp.1050-55.

2. Engels said: "While bringing out the evil aspects of the capital production, establishes with equal clarity that this social form was a necessity so that the powers of production may gradually uplift the society to a level in which human values of all the members could develop equally." *Capital*, Appendixes p.1168.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

In this connection, we may first of all note the success achieved by Marx and the perfection he won by dint of intelligence and the skill in the masterly use of words. This was because he noted, while analysing the capitalist system, that this system comprised in its depths a particular relationship between a capitalist possessing means of production and a hireling who has nothing thereof and therefore forges his production in favour of the capitalist. He concluded from this that the capitalist system depends on the absence of productive powers in the working groups, which are capable of carrying out production and their (production-powers) being limited to the traders so that these groups may be obliged to work with them on wages. This fact is considered as being clear beyond any doubt. But Marx was in need of wordy jugglery so that he may through this fact, reach his goal. That is why he changed his expression and turned from the statement of his and laid emphasis on that the secret of the primary accumulation lies in isolating means of production from the producers, stripping them thereof by force and possession by the traders of these means exclusively. Like this began this great thinker, as though he did not realise the significant difference between the premises he had propounded and the conclusion he ultimately emphasised. Because those premises meant that the absence of the means of production with the groups of people who are capable of working and possession thereof by the traders constitute the basic condition for the existence of capitalism. And this is different from the conclusion which he reached finally and which explained the non-existence of the means of production with the hirelings as their being deprived of the same and wresting thereof from them. This deprivation and wresting is, therefore, a totally new addition not comprised in the analytic premises put forth by him, and which cannot be derived logically from the analysis of the substance of the capitalist system and the relations between the proprietor and the hireling as defined

therein.

Commenting on our statement Marxism may say: True, the capitalist system depends only on non-existence of means of production with the workers and their abundance with the traders but how do we explain that? And how is it that the means of production were not found with the workers, while they were found with the traders, if no movement took place to deprive the workers of their means of production and usurp the same to the credit of the traders?!

Our reply to this statement can be summed up as under:

Firstly, this description does not apply to the societies in which capitalism rested on the shoulders of the feudalist class, as happened in Germany for instance, where a large number of feudalists built factories, carried on their administration and financed them with feudal income they received. It was, therefore not necessary that the change may take place from feudalism to capitalism, following a movement of a fresh usurpation, so long as it was possible for the feudalists themselves to carry out the capital production on the basis of the feudal riches they had acquired in the beginning of the feudal history.

Just as the Marxian description does not apply to the industrial capitalism which grew on the shoulders of the feudal class, it is also not applicable to the commercial capitalism which was constituted with the commercial profits as happened in the Italian Commercial Democracies like Venice and Genoa and Florence etc. Because a class of traders came into being in these cities before the creation of the hirelings of industry that is before the capitalist system came into being, in its industrial sense, for the roots of which Marx is searching. So the industrialists used to work for their own account while those traders purchased from them their production to trade with and thereby earned huge profits by means of trading with the East which flourished following the crusades. Their commercial centre achieved

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

more and more success enabling them to monopolise trade with the East by dint of understanding with the sovereigns of the States, Rulers of Egypt and Syria as the result of which their profits increased whereby they were able to throw off the yoke of feudalism and consequently to set up large factories which swept off, through competition, small handicrafts. On this was, thus, based the capital-production or the industrial capitalism.

Secondly, the Marxian view point is not sufficient to solve the problem because it does not go beyond saying that it was the historical movement which stripped the producing workers of their means and confined them to the hands of the traders, that created the primary accumulation capital, but it does not explain to us as to how it was that a particular group could acquire power of subjugation and committing violence and of forcibly depriving the producers of the means of their production.

Thirdly, suppose that this power of subjugation and committing violence does not need explanation however it does not suit to be a Marxian tool for explaining the primary capital-accumulation and therefore the entire capitalist system, because it is not an economic explanation, and therefore it is not compatible with the substance of the historical materialism. How could Marx himself or his general concept of the history let him say that the reason behind the primary capital-accumulation and the existence of the capitalist class historically was the power of usurpation and subjugation whereas it is itself a reason not economic by nature? As a matter of fact by this analysis Marx demolishes his historical logic himself and admits implicitly that the class-formation does not exist on economic basis alone.

It was proper for him, according to the principles of the historical materialism, to adopt the conventional viewpoint, in explaining the appearance of the capitalist class despite the fact that it presents an explanation more akin to the economic nature than the Marxian explanation.

Lastly all the historical evidences, which Marx gives us thereafter in the chapter of his book, on the movement of usurpation and deprivation, to explain the primary capital accumulation, have been taken only from the history of England, and which depict the usurpations made by the feudalists in England. Because they deprived the farmers of their lands and turned them into pastures throwing the banished persons into the young bourgeoisie markets. It was therefore an operation of depriving the farmer of his land to the credit of the feudalist, rather than a movement of stripping the industrialist of means of production to the benefit of traders.

Before going beyond this point, we would like to cast a passing glance on tens of pages of the book "Capital" which Marx has filled with the description of those violent operation in which the feudalists deprived the farmers of their lands thereby paving the way for the establishment of the capitalist system.

In his exciting description Marx confines himself to the events that took place in England particularly, and while reviewing these events he explains that the real factor which led the feudalists to resort to different forms of violence in driving away the farmers from their lands was that they wanted to transform their forms into pastures for the animals and therefore they were no longer in need of this large army of farmers. But why, in this way and so suddenly, did this general trend take birth, to transform the farms into pastures? Answering this question Marx says:

What particularly opened up the opportunity in England for violent actions was the flourishing of wool factories in Flanders and the resultant rising prices of wool.¹

This answer has its special historical significance, although Marx has not attached importance to it. Because he says that it

1, *Capital*, vol.iii, sec. 2, p.1059

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

was the flourishing of the industrial production in the industrial cities and in the southern part of Belgium particularly Flanders the currency of the capitalist trade in wool and other products generally and the appearance of big markets for those commercial commodities the English feudalists avail of this opportunity and turn their farms into pastures so that they might be able to export wool to the industrial cities and occupy the market for trading in wool, in view of the qualities of the English wool, which had made it of basic importance in the meaning of high quality woollen cloth.¹

It is clear from the narration and study of these events that the factor which Marx regarded as being the historical proof for the coming into being of the capitalist society in England (driving out the farmers) did not emerge from the feudal system itself, as supposed by the disputant logic of the historical materialism. It was not, therefore, the feudal system which gave birth to the inconsistency which dealt a death blow to it, nor were the feudal relations responsible for bringing about the causative factor which Marx meant. It came into being only because of the flourishing of the factories of wool from outside and being in vogue of the capitalist trade in wool. Thus it was the commercial capitalism itself which made the feudalists throw most of the farmers into the markets of the city and not the feudal relations . . . and thus we see even in the picture presented to us by Marx himself that the causes and conditions of the antithesis of the social relations took birth outside those relations. They did not originate from those relations which could not possibly materialise those conditions had they been segregated from exterior factors.

Marx Confession:

Marx realised, therefore, that the primary accumulation of

1. *English History*, p.56.

the industrial capital cannot be explained on the basis of the operations of the usurpation of the feudal class. These operations only explain as to how the Capitalist market found farmers who had been thrown off, by the countryside and consequently they migrated to the cities. That is why he has tried to deal with the problem afresh, in chapter 31 of the '*Capital*. So, in explaining the accumulation, he was not content with the circumstances of commercial or usurious Capitalism which led to the accumulation of huge riches with the traders and the usurers. Because he continues to insist on that the basis of the accumulation is extortion of means of production and the material conditions from the producers and that is why, he resorted to the following statement in explaining the capitalist accumulation:

The discovery of the regions of gold and silver in America, turning the original inhabitants of the country to the life of bondage, their burial in the mines or their annihilation, the beginning of conquest and plundering of the East Indies and the changing of Africa into a sort of trade dens for catching the negroes, were all the innocent moving ways of bringing about the initial accumulation which broke the good news about the dawning of the capitalist period.¹

Once again, we find Marx explaining the appearance of the capitalist society by power, through raiding, plundering and colonisation, although they are elements not Marxist in their nature because they do not express economic values. They only express political and military power.

Strangely enough, Marxism is inconsistent on this point, in pursuance of some suitable way to get rid of dilemma. Thus we find the first Marxist man, after having been obliged to explain the growth of the capitalist entity in the society by the factor of power, saying:

1. *Capital*, p.1116

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

So power is the generator of every old society continuing in growth and power as an economic factor.¹

By expanding concepts of situation, he wants to lend the economic factor an import not too narrow to comprehend all the factors on which he is obliged to rely in his analysis.

On the other side we read, another version of Marxism, in the books of Engels about the power factor, contrary to that about the capitalist developments he writes:

This entire operation can be explained by purely economic factors, there being no need at all, in this explanation, of theft (power) (government or political interference) of any kind. The expression (proprietaryship based on power) in this connection also proves nothing except that it is an expression which a misled person uses to cover his lack of understanding of the real course of affairs.²

While reading the Marx's inciting analytical description of the English capitalism and its historical existence, we do not find any justification to reject it or to object to it, because naturally we do not think of defending the black history recorded by Europe, in the early days of its tyrant materialist renaissance under the shadow of which capitalism grew. But the matter differs when we take his analysis of capitalism and its growth as an expression of the historical necessity without which the capitalist production in industry cannot, theoretically build up its edifice. Therefore, while starting from the real capitalist situation in which, for instance, England lived, Marx has every right to explain its increasing capitalistic riches, at the dawn of its modern history, by the mad colonial activities in which it committed different kinds of crimes on various parts of the earth and by the stripping of the industrialists of their means of production by forces. But

1. *Capital*, sec.2, part III, chap.31, p.1119.

2. *Anti-Diihring*, vol.ii p.32

this does not prove, theoretically, that capitalism cannot possibly be found without those activities and operations and that it carries in its depths the historical necessity of these activities and this means that England had necessarily to witness these activities and operations in the beginning of the capitalism, even if it lived in a different ideological framework. But the history proves contrary to that. Because capitalist production took place in (Flanders) and Italy in the thirteenth century and there grew capitalistic organisations wherein thousands of hirelings produced commodities which raided world markets for the capitalist proprietors, yet during that period no such conditions appeared as existed in England in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which Marx studied in his historical analysis of capitalism.

Let us take another example: The capitalistic production in Japan which began changing, in the nineteenth century, from feudal conditions to the industrialistic capitalism. We have selected this example particularly because Marx made a passing reference, in his statement, to it by saying:

Japan, by its purely feudal organisation in respect of owner-ship of the landed property and the small-scale agriculture there presents to us, in numerous aspects, a picture of midland European ages, more honest than that given by the history book we have and which are obsessed by contending bourgeois ideas.

Let us then examine this honest picture of feudalism as to how it changed into the industrial capitalism? And whether its change is compatible with the historical materialism and Marx explanations of the growth of the industrial capitalism?

Japan was immersed in feudal relations, when it awoke terrified by the alarm-bells warning her against a positive external danger. It was in the year 1853 when the American Fleet rushed

1, *Capital*, sec.2, vol.iii, p.1058.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

into the lake of Oraga and began to negotiate, with the military Governor who enjoyed the authority in place of the Emperor, about concluding agreements. Thus it became quite clear to Japan that it was a beginning of an economic raid which would lead to ruination and colonisation of the country. The thinkers there believed that the only way to save Japan was to industrialise it and put it on the path of capitalistic production which was earlier followed by Europe. They were able to employ leading feudalists themselves in order to materialise this idea. So the feudalists withdrew the authority from the military governor and restored it to the Emperor in the year 1868. The Imperial authority therefore mobilised all its potentials in order to bring about an industrial revolution in the country whereby it could rise to the ranks of the big capitalist states. The people belonging to the aristocratic feudalist class volunteered their services to the ruling authority enabling it to change the country into an industrial one expeditiously. In the meanwhile, a section of the industrialists and traders grew rapidly, who were previously placed in the lowest position in the society. Therefore, they began to utilise, quietly whatever wealth, power and influence they had got, in order to smash the feudal system peacefully. So much so that the prominent feudalist forwent their old privileges in 1871 and the government compensated them, for their lands, by granting them deeds. Thus everything was completed peacefully and the industrial Japan came into being, taking its position in history. Does this description, then, apply to the concepts of the historical materialism and the explanations of Marx??

Marxism asserts that a change from one historical stage to another does not take place except in a revolutionary way as the gradual quantitative changes lead to sudden temporary change although the changeover of Japan from feudalism to capitalism took place peacefully, the leading feudalists forgoing their rights. They did not oblige Japan which was on its way to capitalism,

to effect a revolution like the French revolution in the 1789.

Marxism also believes that no development takes place except through class struggle, between the class supporting the development and the other which tries to oppose it. But we find that the Japanese society entirely favoured the movement for industrial and capitalistic development and even the leading feudalists did not deviate therefrom. All of them believed that the country's life and progress depended on this movement.

Marxism is of the opinion — as we have read in the previous versions of *Capital* that the capitalistic accumulation, which is the basis of the industrialist capitalism, cannot be explained by means of (innocent moving?) to use his expression. It is explained only by acts of violence, raids, operations of deprivation and extortion, although the historical fact of Japan shows otherwise. The capitalistic accumulation did not take place in Japan, nor did the industrialist capitalism grow there as the result of raiding and colonisation or because of the operations of stripping the producers of their means of production. This movement took place only on account of the activity in which the whole of Japan participated and utilised all its political influence in the growth of the ruling authority. Consequently, bourgeoisie appeared on the social stage as the result of these political, ideological and other activities, and not as a power creative for an unsuitable political and ideological atmosphere.

LAWS OF THE CAPITALIST SOCIETY

When we consider the laws of the capitalist society from the historical materialistic point of view, we feel the need of bringing the economic aspect of Marxism which does not become as clear with its full economic features when Marxism analyses and of the stages of the history, as it does when Marxism studies the capitalist stage. Marxism has analysed the capitalist society and

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

its economic conditions and studied its general laws on the basis of historical materialism. It subsequently stressed the inconsistencies lurking in the depths of capitalism and which pile up in accordance with the laws of the historical materialism, until ultimately they take the capitalist system to its inevitable grave in a decisive moment of the history.

LABOUR IS THE BASIS OF VALUE

Like other economists who were his contemporaries or who lived before him, Marx began his study of the substance of the capitalist series society and the laws of the bourgeoisie political economics by analysing the exchange value being the life nerve in respect of the capitalist society, making his analytical theory of value a corner stone of his general theoretical edifice.

Marx did not do anything fundamental in the field of analysing the exchange value. He only adopted the conventional theory which was built by Ricardo before him which says: "Human work is the essence of the exchange value. The exchange value of every product is, therefore, estimated on the basis of the amount of work involved therein, values of different things varying with the difference of labour involved in their production. Thus the price of an article the production of which requires one hour of work is equal to half of the price of an article on the production of which two hours of work are spent, normally."

This theory is regarded as the starting point by Ricardo and Marx both in their analytical study of the framework of the capitalist economy. Each of them has made it the basis of this theoretic edifice. Ricardo had preceded Marx in giving this theory a definite scientific form, but a number of economic thinkers and philosophers even before them both had mentioned it, like the English Philosopher, John Locke who has pointed out this theory in his discussions and then it was adopted in a limited

sphere, by Adam Smith, the well-known classical economist. He regarded work as a basis of the exchange value among the primitive societies . . . But rightly it was Ricardo who lent the theory the import of comprehensibility and believed that work is the general source of the exchange value. Then came Marx, following his path in his peculiar way.

But this does not mean, naturally, that Marx did nothing in regard to this theory beyond resounding Ricardo's theory, but while adopting his theory, he shaped it into his peculiar conceptual framework. Thus he introduced new clarifications in respect of some of its aspects, including therein Marxist element and accepted other aspects thereof just as they were left over by his predecessors.

Therefore, while believing in this theory (work is the basis of value) Ricardo realised that work does not determine the value in conditions where hoarding prevails in which there is no competition as is possible in these conditions that the value of the hoarded commodity may increase in accordance with the laws of demand and supply, without the increase in the work involved in its production. That is why he regarded full competition a based condition for the formation of exchange value on the basis of work. This is what Marx has also said, admitting that the theory does not apply to the conditions of hoarding.

Ricardo also noted that, human work differs in sufficiency so that an hour of work by an intelligent and smart worker cannot possibly be equal an hour of work by a stupid worker. He treated it by prescribing a general measure for the productive sufficiency in every society. Therefore every amount of work creates a value that is compatible therewith, when it agrees with that general measure. This is the very measure which Marx expressed as: necessary amount of work socially when he said, "Every productive work creates a value compatible with it when it is done by the socially recognised method."

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Ricardo found himself - after formulating the theory - obliged to alienate elements of production other than work -like land and capital - from the process of calculating the value as long as it remained the only basis therefrom. For that purpose he put forth, his new theory, in explaining the land revenue whereby he changed the prevalent economic meaning of the income, in order to prove that land has no contribution in creating exchange value in the case of full competition. It was customary with the economists before Ricardo to explain the land revenue as being a boon from nature which grows the rough cooperation between the land and human effort in agricultural production and consequently in creating the resultant exchange value. This means, implicitly, that work is not the only basis of the value. It was, therefore, necessary for Ricardo to reject this explanation of the revenue, in accordance with his theory about the value, and put forward an explanation which may be compatible with the theory. That is what he actually did. He, therefore, asserted that the revenue is the result of the hoarding and it cannot appear in case of full competition. So those people who get hold of the more fertile part of the land secure a revenue as a result of their hoarding and because of the others being obliged to exploit the lands which are less fertile.

As far as the capital is concerned, Ricardo said that capital is but an accumulated work, got stored up and embodied in a tool or matter, to be spent afresh for the purpose of production and therefore, there is no justification in regarding it an independent factor in the creation of the exchange value. Thus the matter in production of which an hour of work has been spent and which has then been consumed in a new operation of production, means a work of an hour added to the new amount of works which is required by the new production. Thus Ricardo concludes that work is the only basis of the value.

It was expected that Ricardo should condemn the capital-

istic profit as long as capital does not create new exchange value and so long as the commodity is indebted in its value to the labour of the worker only. But Ricardo did nothing thereof. He regarded it but logical that the commodity be sold at a rate that may fetch a net profit for him who possesses the capital. He explained this by the spell of time that passes between the investment and the appearance of the product of the sale, thereby admitting time as being another factor for creating the exchange value. Obviously this is deemed as another withdrawal on the part of Ricardo from his theory which says that work constitutes the only basis for the value. This is also considered an inability on his part to stick to his theory to the last.

As for Marx, while dealing with the elements of production, which along with work participate, in the process of production and which Ricardo dealt with before him, he introduced in the concepts of his predecessors, on the one side, some amendments and on the other side, he brought in substantial concepts having their own danger. Thus on the one side he studied the land revenue confirming Ricardo's explanation thereof. He could differentiate between the differential revenue about which Ricardo spoke and the general revenue about which he said that there is revenue of the land as whole based on the natural hoarding which limited the area of the land,. as on the other side he attacked Ricardo's admission about the logicity of the capitalistic profit and launched a violent offensive against it, on the basis of the theory of excessive value which is rightly regarded as vital Marxist part of the theoretic edifice built by Marx.

HOW DID MARX LAY DOWN THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF HIS ECONOMY?

In arguing for the substance of value Marx begins by

1. *Capital*, p.1186

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

differentiating between the use-value and the exchange value. Thus a cot, a spoon and a loaf of bread are a collection of merchandise commodities and each one of these items has a certain use-value inasmuch as it provides benefit. Naturally their use-values differ with the difference in the nature or kind of the benefit man derives therefrom. And each one of these commodities has a value of its own. Take for instance the wooden cot produced by the manufacturer. Just as one can sleep on it — and this is what determines its use-value — similarly one can also exchange it for a cloth to wear. This expresses the exchange-value. Thus, while the cloth and the cot differ from each other in respect of the use-value, we find that they have one common exchange-value, i.e. each one of them can be exchanged for the other in the market because a wooden cot equals a silk cloth of a particular kind.

This equation means that a common thing is found in two different things e.g., the cot and the cloth despite the fact that there is difference between their benefits and the matter. Thus the two things are equal to a third thing which is in its nature neither cot nor cloth and this third thing cannot possibly be a natural or technological characteristic for the commodities because the natural characteristics of the two are taken into account only to the extent of the benefit of use they render. The values and benefits of use found in the cloth and the cot being different, the third thing which is common between them must be something other than use-values and their natural ingredients. Therefore, when we drop from the account these values and set aside all the natural properties of the cloth and the cot there remains nothing but the only property which is common to both the commodities, namely, human work. Both of them, therefore, constitute embodiment of a certain amount of work. And since the two amount of work spent in the production of the cot and the cloth are equal, their exchange value, consequently, would also be equal.. .

Thus the analysis of the process of exchange leads to the conclusion that work is the essence of the exchange value.¹

The price of the commodity in the market is, basically, determined in accordance with this law of exchange value, that is, in accordance with the human work involved therein. But the market price is not compatible with the natural exchange value, which is determined by the law mentioned above, except in case where supply is equal to demand. In this way the price of the commodity could possibly rise above its natural value according to the proportion existing between the demand and the supply. The laws of supply and demand can, therefore, raise or lower the price, that is, they can make it inconsistent with the natural value. But the natural values of commodities play the role of restricting the effect of the laws of supply and demand. Thus, although they allow the price of the commodity to rise above its value due to shortage of the supply and the excessive demand, for instance, yet they do not let this increase take place in an unrestricted form. That is why we find that the price of handkerchief, for instance, cannot possibly rise to the level of that of a car, however much the laws of supply and demand may dominate. This hidden power in the handkerchief which attracts the price for it but which does not allow it to rise unchecked is the exchange value.

Therefore, the natural value is an established fact behind the price, which is created by the work that is involved in the production of the commodities, the price being a market expression thereof which is limited by the natural value while the laws of supply and demand play a secondary role in raising or lowering it, in accordance with the condition of competition, the proportion of the supply to the demand and the extent of the hoarding existing in the market.

1. Vide *Capital*, vol.i, sec.I, chap.I, pp.44-49

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Marx noted — as did Ricardo before him — that this law of value does not apply to the condition in which hoarding exists because the value in such circumstances is determined in accordance with the laws of supply and demand in which the hoarders dominate. Similarly this law of value is not applicable in the case of some kinds of technical and monumental (vestigial) productions like the plate which is produced by the skill of an out-standing artist or a handwritten letter which dates back to hundreds of years. The price of such articles is therefore very high in view of their artistic or historical beauty despite the comparative smallness of the work involved therein.

That is why Marxism declared that the law of value based on the work depends firstly on the existence of full competition and therefore it does not extend to the conditions of hoarding and secondly, on the commodity being a collective production which could always be had by means of collective work. Thus the law does not apply to an individual private production like the artistry painting and the hand-written letter.

We would like before anything else, to indicate a grave phenomenon in the Marxist analysis of the abstinence of value. And it is this that in his analysis and discovery of the law of value, Marx followed a purely a divesting method, divorced from the external fact, and his economic experiments. Thus he suddenly transmigrated into the (metaphorical) personality of Aristotle in the matter of inference and analysis. This phenomenon has its cause which obliged Marx to take this stand. Because the facts which are clear from the economic life always express phenomena entirely inconsistent with the results to which the Marxist theory lead. Because it is a result of this theory: "that the profits earned differ from Project to Project, according to the difference of the amount of work paid for and spent during the production with-out the quantity of the implements and tools having any effect therein. Because they do not add to the product any value more than what they

deprive them of although the profit in the prevailing economic life goes on increasing with the increase in the tools and implements needed by the Project."That is why Marx could not put up his theory by means of evidences from factual economic life and therefore he tried to prove it in a divesting way until when he completed this mission of his, he came to reverse results in the actual economic life, in order to emphasise that they were not found reversed as the result of the fallacy of the theory he behaved in, but they were only a phenomenon of the capitalist society which obliges the society to deviate from the law of natural value and conditioning in accordance with the laws of supply and demand.¹

CRITICISM OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF MARXIST ECONOMY

Let us now examine the Marx law of the value in the light of the evidence he has put forward thereon. Marx starts in his argument as we have seen — from analysing the process of exchange (exchange of the wooden cot with a silk cloth for example). So he finds that the process expresses equality of the cot with the cloth in the exchange value. He then asks: "How is it that the cot and the cloth are equal in the exchange value?" Then he replies by saying that the reason for this is that they have one thing in common, which exists in them in the same degree. And this thing which is common between the cloth and the cot is nothing but the work involved in their production, rather than the benefits and the natural properties in which the cot differs from the cloth. The work, then, is the essence of the value. But what does Marxism say if we adopted this very analytical method, in the process of exchange between a collective production and an individual one ? Does, therefore,

1. *Capital*, p.1185

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

the vestigial letter -and that is what Marxism calls vestigial production - not have an exchange value? Is it not possible to exchange it in the market for cash, a book or for any other thing? So if we exchange it for a collective production like a copy of al-Kāmil's *History*, for instance, it would mean that the exchange value of a page of the vestigial letter, for instance was equal to a copy of the *History* of al-Kāmil. Let us then find out the common thing which lent to the two commodities same exchange value, just as Marxism searched for the common matter between the cot and the cloth. So just as the same exchange value of the cot and the cloth must be an expression of a page common between them (and this is in the opinion of Marxism the amount of work expended in their production), similarly, after the same exchange value of the vestigial letter and a copy of al-Kāmil's *History*, it is (an expression of) the common matter. Can, therefore, this common matter be the amount of the work spent in their production? Naturally never so. Because we know that the work involved in the vestigial letter is far less than that involved in the production of one printed copy of al-Kāmil's *History*, including its paper, cover, ink and the printing. That is why artistic and vestigial commodities have been excepted from the law of value.

We do not blame Marxism for this exception as every law of Nature has its own exceptions and conditions. But we do demand of it - on this basis - an explanation of the matter which is common between the vestigial letter and a copy of al-Kāmil's *History* which have been exchanged with each other in the market in the same way in which the exchange had taken place between the cot and the cloth. If it was necessary that there be a matter common between the two commodities with equal value, beside the equality in the process of exchange, then what is that thing which is common between the vestigial letter and a copy of the *History* of al-Kāmil the two commodities which are

different from each other in so far as the amount of work involved, the nature of the benefit and other peculiarities are concerned? Does not this prove that there is something other than the work involved therein common among the commodities which are exchanged in the market and that this common thing is found in the commodities produced individually in the same way as it exists in those commodities which bear the mark of collective production? And when a common matter is found in all the commodities, despite the difference in the amounts of work involved and in their mark of having been produced individually or collectively and also despite their difference in the benefits and natural and engineering peculiarities, then why should not this be the basic source and internal essence of the exchange value? !

Thus we find that the analytical method adopted by Marx makes him stop in the midway and does not let him continue his inferences, as long as the amounts of work involved in the production of the commodities differ greatly while they are equal to one another in the exchange value. Therefore equality of the amounts of work is not the latent secret behind the equality in the operations of exchange. What is this secret then??

What is that thing which is common between the cot and the cloth and the vestigial letter and the printed copy of the *History* of al-Kâmil, which determines the exchange value of each of these commodities proportionately with its share thereof??

* * * * *

In our opinion there is another difficulty which faces Marx law of value which cannot be overcome by the law because it expresses inconsistency of this law with the natural reality which the people experience, whatever religious or political mark it may have. It is therefore not possible that this law may be a scientific

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

explanation of the fact which contradicts it.

Let us take land as an example to show the inconsistency between the law and the reality. Thus the land is undoubtedly capable of producing a large number of agricultural produces, that is, it can be put to several alternative uses. The land can thus, be utilised for the cultivation of wheat or instead of wheat it can be utilised to obtain cotton and rice etc. And obviously different lands are not similar in their natural capacity for production, as there are some lands which are more capable of production of a certain kind of agricultural production like rice, for example, while there are others which are more capable for the cultivation of wheat and cotton. Similarly every land possesses natural capability for yielding a certain product. This means that if a certain amount of work is spent on a land, properly selected keeping in view of its capability for producing certain kind of crop, it would yield large quantities of wheat, rice and cotton, for instance. But if that very amount of collective work is spent on an improperly selected land, without its capability of producing a certain kind of crop being kept in view, it would be possible to obtain only a part of the quantities obtained in the former case. So can we imagine that this quantity of wheat, for instance, is, in respect of exchange value, equal to that large quantity obtained when the selection of the land was made with due regard to its suitability for the production of a certain kind of yield, only because the work involved in its production is equal to that spent in the former case? And can the Soviet Union which is based on Marxism, allow itself to equalise those two different quantities in respect of the exchange value, because they represent same amount of social work?

The Soviet Union or any other country in the world, undoubtedly, realises practically the loss which it would suffer as the result of not utilising every land to grow such crop as it is most suitable for.

Thus we realise that same amount of agricultural work may result in two different values according to the method adopted in its distribution among the lands of different capabilities.

It is clear, in the light of this, that the greater value which comes to be obtained by utilising every land for the production of that kind of crop for the production of which it is most capable, is not the result of the power expended in the production as the power remains the same and unchanged whether the land is cultivated with what is most suitable for it or otherwise. The greater value is only indebted to the positive role which the land itself plays in promoting and improving the production.¹

And thus we face the earlier question once again as to what is the real content of the exchange value in the constitution of which nature plays a role just as the productive work plays its

-
1. Marxism may, in defence of its point of view say that if production of a kilo of cotton, for instance, requires one hour work in the case of some lands and two hours of work, in the case of some others, it is therefore necessary to take the average in order to know the average collective work necessary to produce one kilo of cotton, which in our example is one and a half hour. Thus one kilo of cotton comes to mean one and a half hours of average collective work, its value being determined, accordingly. Thus one hour work on the land which is more capable would render greater value than that rendered by an hour of work of the other land, because although the two works are equal in individual respect, yet the amount the average collective work involved in one of them is greater than the one embodied in the other. Because one hour work on a fertile land is equal to one and a half hours of average collective work. As for an hour of work on the other land, it equals three fourths ($\frac{3}{4}$) of an hour of average collective work. The difference between the two products in respect of the value is therefore due to the difference of the two works themselves in respect of the amount of average collective work involved in each of them.

But we on our part ask as to how an hour of work on the land more capable for the cultivation of cotton became greater than itself and by dint of whose power it was that half an hour work was added to thereto

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

important role therein?

* * * * *

There is another phenomenon which Marxism cannot explain in the light of its peculiar law about the value although it exists in every society, and this is the falling of the exchange value of the commodity with the decline in the collective desire or demand for it. So any commodity, the desire or demand for which weakens, the society no longer believing in the importance of its benefit, loses a part of its exchange value, irrespective of whether the change in the society's desire (demand) comes about as the result of a political, religious or ideological or any other factor. In this way the value of the commodity falls despite

so that it became equal to the work of one hour and a half? Certainly this half an hour of work which foisted itself, magically, into the work of one hour, making it greater than itself, is not of human production nor is it an expression of a power spent for it, because in utilising the more capable land one does not spend a speck of power more than what one spends in utilising the less capable land. It is but the product of the fertile land itself. Thus it is the fertility of the land which is a magical way, granted half an hour of collective work to the work, free of charge.

Therefore, when this half an hour got into account of the exchange value of the production, it meant that the land, being able to extend an hour of work by lending its power of an hour and a half, plays a positive role in constituting the exchange value and that the productive work on the part of the producer above is not the essence of the value and its sources.

And if the magically earned half an hour of work did not enter the account of the value and the value was determined only in accordance with the work rendered by man, it would mean, the cotton produced with an hour of work done on the land more capable therefore, was equal to the cotton resulting from the work of an hour done on the less capable land. In other words it means that one kilo of cotton was equal to half a kilo thereof.

the fact that the amount of collective work involved therein remains unchanged as also the conditions of its production. This proves clearly that the degree of the utility of a commodity and how far it satisfies the needs has a bearing on the constitution of the exchange value. It is therefore wrong to ignore the nature of the utility value and the degree of the utility of the commodity as is established by Marxism.

While ignoring this phenomenon and trying to explain it in the light of the laws of supply and demand, Marxism stresses another phenomena as being factual expression of its law of value. And that is this: "that the exchange value generally conforms to the work involved in the production of the commodity. When, therefore, the conditions of production were bad and an enhanced amount of work was needed to produce the commodity, its exchange value also increased accordingly. On the other hand, if the conditions of the production improved and half of the previous collective work could be sufficient to produce the commodity, its value also decreased by fifty per cent."

Although this phenomenon is a clear reality in the course of economic life, yet it does not prove that the Marxist law of value is correct. Because as this law can possibly explain the relationship between the value and the amount of work, similarly it can also be explained in another light. For instance, if the conditions of production of paper become bad so that its production required enhanced amount of work, the quantity of the collectively produced paper also fell by fifty percent, in case the total collective work involved in the production of the paper remained the same. And when the quantity of the paper produced decreased by fifty percent, the paper would become more scarce with the demand for it increasing and its maximum benefit enhancing.

Contrarily if the amount of the work needed for the production of paper decreased by fifty percent, it would result in the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

increase of the quantity of the paper produced by the society - in case the total collective work involved in the production of the paper maintained its previous amount. It would also cause its benefit to decline and the paper would also become comparatively less scarce as the result of which its exchange value would also register a decrease.

As long as it is possible to explain the phenomenon in the light of the factor of scarcity or the maximum benefit in the same way as it was possible to explain it on the basis of the Marxist law of value, it cannot possibly be regarded as a scientific evidence, drawn from the actual life, on the correctness of this law to the exclusion of other assumptions.

* * * * *

The work, after this all, becomes a heterogeneous factor which includes units of efforts which differ in importance and vary in degree and value. So there is the technical work which depends on special experience and also simple work which does not require any scientific or technical experience. Thus an hour of work by a porter is different from an hour of work by a building engineer. Similarly one day which a technical manufacturer spends in the production of electric motors is entirely different from the work of the labourer, who digs streamlets in a garden.

There are also many proper factors, which have a bearing on the work, which is regarded a human quality. These factors determine importance of the work and the extent of its effectiveness in the same way as they determine the organic and mental labour required by it. Thus the natural organic and mental aptitude of the worker, his desire to excel others and the kind of feelings he harbours in his mind about the particular work are all factors which make him embark on it, however hard it may

be, or turn away therefrom, however light it may be. Similarly, the feeling of injustice and deprivation which a worker may have or the incentive he may have for invention and innovation as also the circumstances in which he may either feel bored or get hopeful, are all regarded as factors which affect the quality of the work and determine its value.

It is, therefore, a folly to measure a work quantitatively and numerically alone. But it should also be measured qualitatively which might determine the quality of the work in question and the extent to which it was effected by these factors. Thus an hour of work done in a congenial mental conditions is more productive than an hour of work carried out under unfavourable conditions. Thus, just as it is necessary to measure amount of the work which is indeed the objective measuring factor in similarity, it is necessary to measure quality of the work, in the light of different psychological factors which have a bearing thereon and this constitutes the personal factor in the measurement.

It is obvious that while we have minutes of the watch as a means to measure the objective factor i.e. to determine amount of work, we have no such meter to measure the personal factor in the work and its quality which is determined in accordance with it.

Then how does Marxism get rid of these two problems e.g., the problem of a general measurement for technical and non-technical amounts of work and that of qualitative measurement for the effectiveness (sufficiency) of the work, in accordance with the psychological, organic and mental factors which differ from worker to worker.

As for the first problem, Marxism has tried to solve it by classifying work into simple and compound. Thus the simple work means the effort which is expressed by way of the natural power which every evenly built man possesses, without his

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

organic and mental framework having been specially promoted, like carrying of a load by a porter. The compound work is that work in which experience etc. gained through some previous work is utilised like the work of doctors and engineers. Therefore the general meter of the exchange value is the simple work. Since the compound work is a double simple work, it creates exchange value greater than that created by the single simple work. Thus the work which an electrical engineer performs in a week in making a special electric apparatus is greater than the work of a porter which he does in a week in carrying loads, keeping in view the fact that the work of the engineer includes the work done by him, previously, in order to gain special experience in engineering.

But can we explain the difference between a technical and non-technical work on this basis?

This explanation given by Marxism of the difference that exists between the work of the electrical engineer and that of a simple worker means that if the electrical engineer, for instance, spends twenty years to gain scientific knowledge and technical experience in electrical engineering and thereafter practises the work for another twenty years, he would obtain a value for the total product he realises during the two decades, which was equal to the value created by the porter through participation in the production by way of carrying loads for a period of four decades. In other words two days' work of the porter who participates in the production in his own way is equal to one day's work of the electrical engineer, in view of the fact that it contains a study work done previously. So is it the fact that we see in the course of the economic life? Or can any market or stage agree to exchange the product of two days' work by a simple worker for one day's work of an electrical engineer?

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union, to its good luck, 'does not think of adopting the Marxist theory about the simple

and compound work, otherwise it would sustain ruination if it declared that it was prepared to give one engineer against two simple workers. That is why we find that a technical worker in Russia sometimes gets a salary ten times or more than that of a simple worker despite the fact that he does not spend even nine times the age of a simple worker in the studies and in spite of the fact that technically competent hands are available in Russia sufficiently, in the same way as the simple workers are. Therefore the difference is attributable to the law of value rather than the supply and demand conditions and this is a big difference so that it is not sufficient, for its explanation, to include the previous work as a factor in the constitution of the value.

As for the second problem (i.e. qualitative measurement of the sufficiency of work, in accordance with psychological, organic and mental factors which differ from worker to worker), Marxian has got rid of it by adopting collective average of work as a meter to measure the value. Thus Marx writes:

The collectively necessary time for producing commodities is that which is needed for any operation (work) being carried out with an average amount of dexterity and power under normally natural conditions in respect of certain collective environments. Therefore it is work alone or the necessary time needed for the production of any kind in a certain society which determines the quantity of the value regarded — generally as an average copy of its kind.¹

On this basis, when the producing worker enjoyed such conditions as raise him from above the collectively average degree, he could possibly create for his commodity, in one hour of work, a value higher than that created by an average worker during that hour because an hour of his work was greater than an hour of the average collective work. Thus the collective

1. *Capital*, vol.i, pp.49-50.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

average of the work and of various factors thereof, constitutes the general measure 'of the value.

The folly which Marxism commits in this regard is that it always studies the issue as being one of quantity. Therefore the high conditions that are available to the worker are, in the opinion of Marxism, but factors which help the worker in producing a larger quantity in less time with the result that the quantity which he produces in one hour becomes greater than the quantity produced in an hour of the collective average work and therefore 'of greater value so that while this worker produces two meters of cloth in one hour, an average mediocre worker produces during that hour only one meter. Thus the value of the two meters of cloth in one hour, an average. Thus the value of the two meters would be four times the value of this one meter because they represent two hours of general collective work although their production was actually completed with one hour of specialised work.

But the thing which is notable is that the intellectual, physiological and psychological conditions which an average worker does not possess do not always mean increase in the quantity of production made by a worker who is in possession thereof. But sometimes they mean qualitative distinction of the commodity produced. There are two painters for instance each one of whom has one hour to paint a picture, but natural ability of one of them may make the picture painted by him more charming than that painted by the other one. The question here, therefore, is not that of producing larger quantity in less time but the one who does not possess that natural talent cannot produce a similar picture even if he spends double the time in painting the picture. Therefore we cannot say that the picture which is more charming represented two hours of general collective work because even two hours of general collective work are not sufficient to produce that picture which the gifted

painter produced due to his natural ability.

Here we reach the basic point in regard to these two pictures and that is this, that the two differ in their values undoubtedly, in the market, irrespective of its political nature or the proportion in the demand and the supply. Because no one would like to exchange the charming picture for the other one even if the supply and demand were proportionate. This means that the charming picture earns additional value from an element which is not found in the other one. This element is not the amount of work because the charm of the picture - as we have seen - does not represent more amount of work. It simply represents the quality of work involved in its production. Therefore the quantitative meter of work — or in other words the minutes of the watch — is not enough to determine value of the commodities in which different amount of work were involved. It is therefore not possible always to find in the amount of individual or collective work an explanation for the difference in exchange values of the commodities because this difference is at times attributable to quality rather than quantity, to the kind and peculiarity and not to the number of the hours of work.

These are some of the theoretical difficulties in the way of Marx which prove inability of the Marxist law to explain the exchange value. But despite all these difficulties Marx felt obliged to adopt this law, as is quite clear from his theoretical analysis of value which we reviewed in the beginning of this discussion. Because while trying to discover the matter that is common between two different commodities, like cot and cloth, he did not take into account the utilitarian benefit and all the natural and mathematical peculiarities, because the cot differs from the cloth in its benefit and physical and mathematical properties. It then appeared to him that the only thing which remained common between the two commodities is the human work done during their production and here lies the basic mistake in the analysis, because although the two

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

commodities offered in the market at one price, there are different in their benefits and their physical, chemical and mathematical peculiarities but despite that the psychological trend existing in the same degree is common between them and that is the human desire to possess that commodity and that. Thus there is collective desire for the cot as also for the cloth. This desire is attributable to the use and benefit they have in them. In this way, although the benefits they render are different from each other yet the result produced is common between them which is the human desire. It is not necessary in view of this common element — that work be regarded basis of the value, being the only common matter between the exchanged commodities, as Marxism thinks, so long as we found a matter common between the two commodities, other than the work involved in their production.

Thereby collapses the main argument put forward by Marx to prove his law and it becomes possible for the common psychological trait to take the place of the work and that it be adopted as a meter for the work and a source thereof. It is only in this way that we can possibly get rid of the former difficulties which faced Marx and it is only thus that we can explain — in view of this new common matter — the phenomena which the Marxist law of value failed to explain. Therefore the matter common between the vestigial letter and a printed copy of the *History* of al-Kāmil, for which we were searching but could not find constituted in work because of the difference of the amounts of work involved in them and which could explain the exchange value, could be found in this new psychological meter. Thus the vestigial letter and the printed copy of al-Kāmil's *History* have the same exchange value because the collective desire for them exists equally.

Similarly all other problems melt off in the light of this new meter.

Since the desire for a commodity results from the benefit of use (usefulness) it provides, it is not possible to drop it from the account of the value. That is why we find that a commodity which has no benefit commands no exchange value generally, however much be the work involved in its production. Marx himself admitted this fact but he did not describe to us — nor was it possible for him to do so — the secret of this link existing between its usefulness and the exchange value and as to how the usefulness participated in constituting the exchange value although he had dropped it from the very beginning because it differs from the very beginning because it differs from commodity to another. But in the light of the psychological meter, the link between the usefulness and the value becomes quite clear, as long as the utility remained the basis of the desire and the desire was the meter of the value and the general source thereof.

Although the utility is the main basis of the desire but it does not determine the desire for a thing alone, because the degree of the desire — for any commodity — is proportionate with the importance of the benefit it renders. Therefore, the greater the benefit of a commodity (usefulness) greater the desire for it and the degree of the desire is proportionate conversely with the extent of the possibility to obtain the commodity. Thus the greater the possibility of the availability of the commodity, the lesser the degree of the desire for it and consequently its value falls. And obviously the possibility of obtaining the commodity depends on the scarcity or the abundance thereof. Because in a natural way to such an extent that it may be possible to obtain it from nature, without making any efforts, like the air. In such a condition, the ex-change value is zero because of the desire being non-existent and the lesser the possibility of obtaining a commodity because of its scarcity or the difficulty in its production, the more the desire for

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

it and greater its value.¹

MARXIST CRITICISM OF CAPITALIST SOCIETY

Some people think that we study the Marxist views about the capitalist society only with intention to falsifying them, and justifying capitalism, because it is recognised in the Islamic society which believes in the capitalistic ownership of means of production and refuses to adopt the principle of the socialistic ownership and therefore as long as Islam embraces capitalism it is necessary for the followers of Islam to ridicule Marxist views regarding the capitalist position of the livelihood in our modern history, and to put forward arguments to show the mistake of

1. This exposition is more applicable to the reality than the theory of maximum benefit, based on the law of the inconsistency of value. According to this theory value of a commodity is estimated on the basis of the potentiality of satisfying the desire the last one of the units of the commodity possesses. The last unit possesses the least power of satisfying the desire, in view of the gradual inconsistency of the desire with the satisfaction. That is why abundance of a commodity causes inconsistency of the maximum value and fall of its value in a general way,

This theory does not represent the reality completely, because it does not apply to some cases in which consumption of the first unit or units might cause more desire and dire need for consumption of new units, as happens in the case of those materials, which get into vogue rapidly. If therefore, the theory of the maximum benefit was correct its result would have been that the exchange value, in such cases, increased with the increase in the units of the commodity offered in the market, because the desire or the requirement at the time of the consumption of the second unit is greater than that at the time of the consumption of the first unit. But the facts generally indicate otherwise which proves it is not the degree of the need one feels, for the satisfaction, at the time of the consumption of the last unit, which constitutes the general meter of the value, but it is the degree of the possibility of obtaining (the commodity) which - along with the quality of the benefit and its importance - determine, the value of the commodity.

the Marxist analysis in so far as he brings out the complications of this reality and its inconsistencies as also its horrible results which go on becoming grave until they exterminate it.

Something like this does occur to the minds, but the fact is that Islamic attitude or stand does not oblige a researcher to defend the capitalistic aspect of the livelihood and its collective systems. What is necessary is to bring out the part which is common between the Islamic society and the capitalist one and to study the Marxist analysis in order that the extent of its relationship with the common part becomes clear.

It is therefore a mistake to defend the reality of the Western Capitalism and deny its mistakes and evils, as some religious people do, behaving that this is the only way to justify the Islamic economy, which recognises private ownership.

It would also be mistake –after we have come to know the economic fact does not constitute the basic factor in the society– to follow the method adopted by Marx to analyse the capitalist society and discover the factors of its ruination. Because he considered all the results revealed by the capitalist society on the stage of history, as the outcome of a basic principle of this society i.e. the principle of private ownership. So any society which believes in private ownership necessarily proceeds in the historical direction in which the capitalist society had marched sustaining the same results and inconsistencies.

Thus to settle the account with Marxist's stand vis-à-vis the capitalist society, I consider it necessary that we should always stress these two facts.

Firstly: That it is not the religious duty of Muslim scholars doing research in the economy to justify the situations (conditions) of the capitalist society and to meet its bitter realities in a hostile manner.

And secondly, it is not possible to regard the historical reality of the modern capitalist society as the true picture of

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

every society which allows private ownership of the means of production, nor is it possible to generalise the conclusions reached by the researcher as the result of his study of the modern capitalist society and apply them to all other societies which agree with it in the belief in private ownership despite their frameworks and limits being different from those of the modern capitalist society.

Marxism condemns the principle of private ownership, with all the results produced by the capitalist society, in consonance with its basic concept about the explanation of the history which says that the economic factor, which is represented by the nature of the ownership in vogue in the society, is the corner stone in the entire social entity. Thus all that happens in the capitalist society has its roots in the economic principle of the private ownership of the means of production. Thus the increasing misery, networks of hoarding, atrocities of colonialism, armies of the unemployed people and serious inconsistency in the heart of the society are all the results and historical links to which every society believing in private ownership is subjected.

Our view point about these Marxist views regarding capitalist society is summed up in two points:

First, they represent a mingling up of the private ownership of the means of the production and the reality thereof characterised by a certain economic, political and conceptional nature. Thus complications of this foul reality are regarded as inevitable results for any society that allows private ownership.

Second, they are mistaken about the so-called scientific and economic foundations which lend Marxism its scientific character in its analysis of the inconsistencies and historical developments of the capitalistic society.

INCONSISTENCIES OF CAPITALISM

Let us now start with the most important of the inconsis-

tencies of the capitalistic society, in the opinion of Marxism, or in other words, the main axis of the inconsistency, which is the profit which flows abundantly to the capitalist owners of the means of production through the production on wage basis. It is thus the profit in which lies the secret of the so-called inconsistency and riddle of the entire capitalism, which Marx tried to discover in the excessive value as he believes a commodity owes its value to the paid work involved in its production. Therefore, when a capitalist purchases some wood for one 'Dinâr' and then engages a worker on wage to make a cot thereof which he sells for two Dinârs, the wood earns a new price which represents the second Dinâr added to the price of the raw wood. The source of this new value is but the work, according to the Marxist law of value. So in order that the owner of the wood and the tools may earn some profit he should pay only a part of the new value - which was created by the worker - as a wage for his work, and retain the remaining portion of the value as his own profit. Hence it is always necessary that the worker produces a value which is greater than his wage. It is this addition which Marx calls the excessive value and regards it as the general source of benefit for the entire capitalist class.

Marx alleges -while explaining the profit to us in this light- that this is the only explanation for the entire issue of capitalism. Because when we analyse the process of the capitalistic production we find that the owner bought from the trader all the materials and tools which are needed for production as also from the worker all the human power required for the production. Thus these are two exchanged and on examination we find that both the exchanging persons can benefit in respect of the usefulness because each of them exchanges a commodity - possessing usefulness which he does not need, for another one the benefit of which he needs. But this does not apply to the exchange value, as the exchange of commodities in its natural form, constitutes

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

exchanging of equals and wherever equality exists there can be no profit because each one gives a commodity in exchange for another one having an equal exchange value. This being the case, whence could have an excessive value or a profit?!

Marx goes on to emphasise, in his analysis, that it is impossible to suppose that the seller or the buyer would earn profit at random in view of his being able to sell the commodity at a price higher than its purchase price or that he could purchase it at a price less than its value. Because ultimately he would lose what he had got as a profit, when his role changed and he became a buyer after being a seller or he became seller after having been a purchaser. No surplus value can, therefore, formulate neither as a result of the sellers selling the commodities at a price higher than their value nor because of the buyers buying them for a price less than their value.

It is also not possible to say that the producers get a surplus value because the consumers pay higher price for the commodities than their value so that their owners — being the producers had the privilege of selling the commodities at a higher rate. Because this privilege does not represent the riddle as every producer is regarded, in another respect, as a consumer and thus being so, he loses what he gains as a producer.

Thus Marx concludes from this analysis that the surplus value which is gained by the capitalist is but a part of the value which the workers work lends to the material. The owner secures this part simply because he does not purchase from the worker - whom he employed for ten hours - his labour during this period so that he may be obliged to equally compensate for his labour or in other words, give him a compensation which is equal to the value created by him. Because labour cannot possibly be a commodity to be purchased by the capitalist with a certain exchange value - because the work is the essence of value in the opinion of Marx, and thus all the things owe their values to the

work, which on its part does not earn its value from anything. It is therefore, not a commodity. In fact the commodity which the owner purchases from the worker is the power of work, a commodity the value of which is determined by the amount of the work necessary for retaining and reviewing that power i.e. by the amount of work which is essential to sustain the worker and to preserve his faculties. So the owner purchases from the worker power for working for ten hours rather than the work itself. He purchases this power with the value which ensures to the worker creation and renewal of that power and that is the wages. Since the work of ten hours is greater than the work whereupon depends the renewal of the faculties of the worker and his sustenance, the capitalist retains the difference of the value of the power of work, paid to the worker and the value created by the work itself, which he receives from the worker. This difference is constituted by the surplus value which the capitalist gains.

In the light of this Marx believes that he has discovered the main inconsistency in the framework of capitalism which is represented in the fact. that the owner purchases from the worker his power of work but he receives from him the work itself and that it is the worker who creates all the exchange value but the owner makes him forge and be content only with a part of the value created by him and thus steals away the remaining part being a surplus. It is on this that the class struggle between owners class and workers class is based.

This theory (theory of surplus value) first of all holds that the only source of the value of the commodities is the work spent in their production. If the worker received all the value created by him nothing would be left for anyone else to gain. Therefore, in order that the owner may have some profit, he must set aside for himself a part of the value which the worker creates in his product. The theory of the surplus value therefore — basically

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

centres round the Marxist law of value. This link believes the theory and the law unifies their end and makes laws' failure, theoretically, a cause of the fall of theory as well as fall the theories of Marxist Economy which are based on that law.

* * * * *

In our study of Marx's law of value, as the back born of the entire Marxist economy, we have come to know that work is not the basic substance of exchange value, but the value is measured with a personal psychology which is the collective desire. And when the desire is the essence of the exchange value and its source, we would not be obliged to always interpret the profit as being a part of the value which is created by work, as Marx does. We cannot, in that case, ignore the process of constitution of the commodities' value, as a share of the raw material, comparatively scarce. Thus the modern material, for instance, being a comparatively scarce natural material — though not as rare as air — possesses an exchange value and participates in the creation of the exchange value of the cot, in the light of the psychological meter of value despite the fact that no human work is spent in the production. The same is the case with all the natural materials embodied in various commodities produced, which have been completely ignored by Marxism which does not believe that they have any role to play in constituting the exchange value of the commodities, as he thinks that they are of no exchange value as long as they do not represent work spent to bring them about.

It is true that raw material, while it exists inside the earth associated by human work appears to be insignificant and does not have any special importance unless it is mingled with human work. But this does not mean that the material has no exchange value and that all the value results from the work alone as is believed by Marxism because as this description applies to a

mineral material lying inside the earth, it also applies to the work which is involved in extracting the material and its adjustment. Because without the mineral material this work was of no value at all. It is easy to imagine the insignificance of this amount of human work spent on extracting a mineral like gold, if it was spent on sport or jesting or in mining rocks which avail nothing. The two elements (material and work) therefore conjointly constitute the exchange value 'of the amount produced from the mine, for instance, and each of them has a positive role to play in constituting the commodity of gold which enjoys a special exchange value in accordance with its psychological meter.

Just as the material has its share of the value of commodities in the light of the psychological meter of the value, similarly different elements of production must also be taken into account. Thus an agricultural produce does not derive its exchange value from the amount of the work involved in its production alone but the land has also a bearing on this value. This is proved by the fact that when this very amount of work is spent on cultivating the land with a crop for which it is less suitable, it gets a produce that does not have the same exchange value which the first one had. When the raw material and different elements of production have a bearing on the creation of value, the entire value, therefore, does not come forth from the work nor is the worker the only source of the value of the commodity. Consequently it is not necessary that the surplus value (profit) be a part of the value which the worker creates as long as it could possibly represent the share of the natural production material in the value of the commodity produced.

After this there remains one question connected with this value which the commodity derives from Nature: viz., to whom does this value belong and who is its owner? And is it the property of the owner or of anyone else? This is another point which does not fall within the purview of the discussion. The

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

point we were discussing was the relationship of the surplus value has with the work and whether it must be a part of the value created by the work or could it come forth from some other source? So when Marx regarded work as the only basis of the value, he could not explain the surplus value (the profit) except by cutting a part of the value created by the worker. But in the light of another meter for the value like the psychological meter, it is possible for us to explain the surplus value without being obliged to regard it as a part of the value which the worker creates. In a society exchange values always go on increasing –as do its riches continuously "-through the incorporation of new amounts of work in the natural materials and the coming into being of ready made commodities thereby carrying the exchange value derived from the two elements – the work and the natural material — which got incorporated therein. These two elements could –through their merger and partnership – create a new value which was not to be found in anyone of them in case of its existence independently of the other.

There is another thing which Marxism did not take into its account while trying to discover the secret of the profit for which we find no justification even if we adopted Marx law of value and that is the portion of the value which the owner creates for him-self by means of his administrative and managerial talents which he utilises in running an industrial or agricultural project. Experiments have made it quite clear that projects with equal capitals and equal number of workers taking part therein may vastly differ from one another in so far as the profits earned by them are concerned, in accordance with the organisational efficiencies. Thus administration constitutes a practical element necessary for the process of production and the success thereof. To materialize successful production operation it is not enough to have abundant working hands and the necessary tools, but the operation of production needs a leader who may determine as to

how many workers and tools were necessary. He should also determine the proportion in which they were to be used together, beside assigning duties and works to different workers and employees. Besides all this, he should completely supervise the operation of production and thereafter, find out ways of its distribution and make it reach the consumers. So if the work was the essence of the value, the administrative and supervisory work must share the value created in the commodity by the work. It is not possible for Marx to explain the profit, in view of the theory of surplus value, except in relation to the value which the usurious capitalist earns or the capitalistic projects in which the proprietor does not participate by way of management and administration.

The theory of surplus value having collapsed following the collapse of its theoretical basis represented in Marxist law of value, we should naturally reject the class inconsistencies which Marxism deduces from this theory, as the inconsistency between the worker and the owner as being a thief so to say who gets away with a portion of the surplus value created by the former and the inconsistency between what the owner buys and receives from the worker. Because according to Marx, he buys from him the power of work and receives the very work from him.

Thus the first inconsistency depends on the explanation of the profit, in the light of the theory of surplus value. But in a different light, it is not necessary that the profit be a part of the value which the worker creates for himself, so long as the value had a source other than the work. Consequently it is not necessary, under the system of paid work, that the owner should steal away from the worker some of the value created by the latter, so that the class struggle between the owner and the worker be an inevitable phenomenon under this system.

It is true that the interest of hirers lies in the decreasing of wages whereas the hireling's interest lies in the rise of the wage. Thus their interests differ as do those of the hirers themselves.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

It is also true that rise or fall in the wage means loss to one party while the other stands to gain. But this is different from the Marxist meaning of the class inconsistency, according to which the inconsistency and embezzlement are part and parcel of the real relations between the hirer and the hireling, whatever its form or shape be. Thus the class inconsistency in its theoretical and firm objective form is based on the basis of the Marxist. Marxist economy collapses with the collapse of these basis. As for the inconsistency in the sense of difference of interests, which makes one party struggle for rise in the wages, while the other party tries to maintain their level, it is indeed an established inconsistency and it is not connected with the so-called theoretical basis of the Marxist economy. But it is like the difference of interests of the sellers and the buyers which makes the sellers raise the prices while the buyers work to resist the same. The same is the case with the interests of technical workers and non-technical workers as it lies in the interest of a technical worker to secure a high level of wages while the rest of the workers demand full parity in the wages.

As for the second inconsistency that exists between what the owner buys from the worker and what he gives to him, it depends on the previous Marxist opinion which holds that the commodity which the owner buys from the worker – in a society allowing work on wage – is the power of work and not the work itself as repeatedly told by the hackneyed capitalist economy, as Marxism find it. Because in the opinion of Marx work is the essence of the value and its meter and therefore it cannot have a value which could be measured or estimated so that it could be sold for that value. But contrary is the case with the power of work for it represents the amount of work involved therein or, in other words, on nourishing the worker - so that value of the power of work could be measured with the work spent therefor and whereby it could become a commodity having some value which

the owner could buy from the worker for that value.

But the reality established by the Islamic economy in this regard is that the owner does not own and buy work from the workers, as believed by the 'hackneyed' capitalist economy, as Marxism put it, nor does he buy the power of work, as the Marxist economy holds. Therefore, it is neither the work nor the power of work that is the commodity or the property which the owner buys from the worker and pays for it. What the owner purchases from the worker is the benefit of his work, that is the material effect caused on the natural material by the work. Thus when the owner of the wood and the tools hires a worker so that he may make a cot from that wood, he would be giving him the wage as the price of the form and the modification which the wood would assume, making it a cot as the result of the work of the worker. Therefore, this modification whereby the wood becomes a cot, is the material effect of the work which is consequently the benefit of the work, purchased by the owner from the worker with the wage. Therefore the benefit of the work is something different from the work and the power of work. Similarly it is not a part of the man's entity. It is but a commodity having a value proportionate with the importance of the benefit, in accordance with the general psychological meter of value (meter of the collective desire — demand). The owner, thus purchases from the worker the benefit of his work and he secures this benefit contained in the wood which in our previous example has become a cot through modification, without there being any inconsistency between what he purchases and what he receives.¹

We should not let ourselves overlook the difference between the benefit of the work and the relatively scarce raw material like the wood and the mineral material. Because although they all have exchange values, in accordance with the

1. Vide *Munyatu 't-ṭālib fī ḥāshiyati 'l-kitāb*, p.16.

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

general meter of value, but the benefit of the work — which means the modification form that occurs in the natural material as the result of the work like the wood which becomes a cot — as being something having a commodity resulting from human work, enjoys (possesses) the element of will and examination. It is thus possible for the human will to intervene in making the goods scarce and thereby raise its price as do the workers' syndicates in the capitalist countries. Therefore, it appears — at the first sight — as though these goods determine their prices themselves at random and in harmony with the extent of the powers of these syndicates. But actually they are subject to the very general meter of value. But the human will can at times possibly come in making the meter rise whereby the wages increase.

* * * * *

Having studied the theory of surplus value, let us now continue to review the other stages of Marxism's analysis of the capitalist society. We have known — so far — that Marx based the theory of surplus value on his peculiar law of value and explained the nature of the capitalist profit, in the light thereof, concluding therefrom that the basic inconsistency in capitalism lies in the capitalistic profit, being that part of the value created by the paid worker, which the owner steals and cuts therefrom for himself.

Having dealt with his two fundamental intricate theories (i.e. the law of value and the theory of surplus value) and after he felt satisfied with the discovering them from the basic inconsistency in capitalism; he began to deduce the laws of this inconsistency in the light thereof, which leads capitalism to its inevitable doom.

The first of these laws in the law of the class — struggle in which the hirelings plunge against the capitalist class. The idea

in this law centres round the basic inconsistency between the wages paid by the capitalist to the worker and the produce he receives, which has been discovered by the theory of surplus value. Since the owner deprives the worker of a part of the value created by him and pays him but a part thereof, his position vis-à-vis the worker is, so to say, that of a thief, which naturally leads to a grim struggle between the two classes, one which steals and the other, the victim of stealing.

Thereafter comes another law to play its role in intensifying this struggle, i.e. the law of the falling of the profit or in other words the permanent downward trend of the profit rate.

Under this law, the idea is based on the belief that the competition among the production projects, which dominate the first stages of capitalism, leads to the competition among the capitalist producers themselves and naturally this competition makes the capitalist production go forward, making each capitalist desirous of promoting and improving his project in order to obtain more profit. Because of this, no one of the proprietors class finds a way out but to transform a part of his profit into the capital and continuously avail of the scientific and technical progress to improve the tools and implements or to have them replaced by those which are more effective and more productive so that he could keep face with his competition in the movement of capitalistic, production and should not fall down in the mid-way. Thus the very constitution of the capitalist society has the potentiality to oblige the capitalist to accumulate the capital and to improve and promote the tools, which means the power of competition among the capitalist themselves.

This need to accumulate the capital gives birth to the law of the profit rate ever falling. Because the capitalist production depends, in its promotion, increasingly on the tools and equipment, according to the scientific progress in this field, with the amount of work needed decreasing proportionately with the

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

improvement and competition of the tools and equipments. This means the fall in the new value created by the production, in accordance with the decrease in the amount of work involved in this regard. Consequently, the profit falls which represents a part of the new value.

To meet this necessity (of the fall in the profit), the capitalists have no remedy but to demand from the workers to put in greater amounts of work with the same old wage or to reduce their lot of the new value created by them by accepting less wages. This leads to the intensification of the struggle between the two classes whereby increasing misery and destitution in the workers' circles becomes an inevitable law in the capitalist society.

It is but natural grave crisis should take place thereafter as the result of the capitalists being unable to circulate their commodities, consequent upon the lowering of the level of the purchasing power of the masses, necessitating search for foreign markets. Thus capitalism enters the stage of colonisation and monopolisation with a view to ensuring the profits of the ruling class while the comparatively weak people belonging to the bourgeois class fall in the ravine of monopolisation so that the sphere of this class becomes narrow gradually while that of the toiling class widens because it most warmly welcomes those weak members of the bourgeois class who fall down on the battle of the capitalistic monopolisation. On the other hand the bourgeois class begins to lose its colonies due to the free movements in these colonies and the crisis aggravate little by little until the historical movement curve reaches the decisive point where entire capitalist entity crashes in revolutionary movement inflamed by the workers and labourers.

* * * * *

This is a brief picture of the stages of the Marxist analysis of capitalism which we can now analyse in the light Of our former study.

It will thus be noticed clearly that the fate of the law of the class struggle which is based on the inconsistency latent in the profit, depends on the theory of the surplus value. Therefore when this theory collapsed — as we have seen — this so-called theoretical inconsistency also vanished and the idea of the class struggle inspired by that inconsistency stood falsified.

As for the law of the fall in the profit, it is but the result of the central principle of the Marxist economy, i.e. the law of value. Because in the opinion of Marx the reduction of the amount of work spent during the production, resultant from the improvement and increase in the tools, causes fall in the value of the commodity and decrease of the profit because the value is but the offspring of the work. Therefore when the amount of work decreased due to increased tools, the value registered a fall and the profit shrank which represents a part of the resultant value. And when the law of the fall in the profit was based on the central principle which says that the work is the only substance of the value, it fell down naturally with the falling of that principle, in our former study and it became possible theoretically that the profit rate should be inconsistent with the increase in the tools and the raw material and the decrease in the amount of work, so long as the work was not the only substance of the value.

After this, let us take up the law of the increasing- misery. This law rests on the basis of unemployment caused by the modem tools and means taking the place of the workers on the process of production. Thus every apparatus or improvement in the apparatus and the equipment throws a number of workers out of employment. And since the production movement progresses continuously, the army of the unemployed, which Marx

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

calls Reserved Army of the Capitalists, would go on increasing leading to added misery and destitution and starvation here and there.

As a matter of fact Marx has derived this law from Ricardo's analysis of the tools and their effect on the worker's life. Because Ricardo had already adopted the theory of unemployment caused by the lessening of the need for workers, following the manufacture of the required quantity of the more effective equipments and tools. Marx has added another phenomenon to it, resulting from replacing the work by the tools, i.e., the possibility of employing any evenly built human being including women and children in the process of instrumental production, without there being need of these persons having previous experience. In this way skilled workers are replaced by others, with lower wages and the power of the workers to bargain about the wages decreases and consequently the misery increases and gets aggravated day by day.

When after Marx, the Marxists found that the misery in capitalist, European and American societies did not grow and intensify in accordance with the law of Marx, they were obliged to interpret the law by saying that the comparative misery goes on increasing although the condition of the workers, considered separately from that of the capitalists, continues to improve with the passage of time due to different causes and factors. In this we find an example, from among the examples, we had explained in the course of our study of the mixing up by Marxism of the laws of economy and the social realities and how it incorporated the two with each other in a manner leading to faulty results, because of Marxism's insistence on explaining the entire society in the light of economic phenomena. Let us suppose, for instance, that the comparative condition of the workers, i.e., their condition in comparison with that of the capitalists — worsens with the passage of time, but on the other

hand, it improves in respect of abundance and plenty, viewed independently. If this is true, Marxism has a right to give out a limited economic explanation for this phenomenon. But it has no right to give a social explanation for it and therefore declare the necessity of the enhancement of misery in the society. Because the worsening of the comparative condition does not mean misery as long as it improves in an independent form. Marxism has been obliged to revert to this very explanation in order that it may be able there-by to discover the positive power leading to revblution, which is the ever-increasing misery. Marxism could not have reached this discovery if it had not borrowed social names for the economic phenomena and if it had not described as misery the comparative worsening condition.

And finally, what are the causes of destitution and poverty which Marxism find overshadowing the capitalist society?

Indeed the destitution, want, different kinds of poverty and loaf do not result from allowing private ownership of the means of production. They are but the outcome of the capitalistic framework of such an ownership and because of this ownership sweeping off all the means of production as also non-recognition of the general ownership and the established rights in the private wealth for social security and also of special stimulation of the powers of the owners in respect of the disposal of their wealth. But in case the society allows private ownership of the means of production and besides, lays down principles for the general ownership of a large number of the means of production and the social security and economic freedom limited by the public interest which prevents the wealth from concentrating in the hands of a few people. Thus in a society which ensures all this and enforces these principles, no shadow of misery or any of the phenomena of destitution and misfortune which sprang from the nature of the capitalist system in the European societies.

* * * * *

THE THEORY OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

As for colonialism, we have seen that Marxism gives a purely economic explanation of this also and therefore it regards it as an inevitable result of the higher stage of capitalism, when the local markets and wealth turn insufficient to satisfy the interests of the capitalist class whereupon it feels obliged to possess markets and riches of foreign countries through colonisation.

But the fact is that colonialism does not constitute an economic expression of the backward stage of capitalism. It is but a practical expression, in a deeper manner, of the material intellectualism with its moral measures and its meanings of life and its aims and objects. Because it is this intellectualism which made the achievement of the greatest possible material profit the main objective, regardless of the nature of the means, their moral disposition and their long-range results.

This is proved by the fact that colonialism began ever since capitalisms began its historical existence in the European societies, with its intellectualism and its measures without waiting for capitalism to reach its higher stage so that it may constitute an expression of a purely economic need. Thus the European countries divided the weaker countries among themselves in the early period of capitalism expressly and with all shamelessness. Thus to the lot of Britain fell India, Burma, S. Africa, Egypt and Sudan, etc. while France got Indo-China, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Madagascar and other colonies, and Germany had sectors in W. Africa and the Pacific Islands. Similarly Italy possessed western Tripoli and Somaliland, whereas Belgium got hold of Congo countries. Russia took sectors in Asia and Holland secured Indian Islands,

The real and foremost cause of colonialism, thus, lies in the spiritual reality and moral temperament of the society and not simply in the private ownership of the means of production being allowed. Therefore if this ownership is allowed in a society which enjoys a spiritual, moral and political reality, different from the

capitalist one, then the colonialism with its capitalistic import is not an inevitable law for it.

As for the monopoly, it is also not a necessary result of the private ownership of the means of production being allowed. It is but a result of the capitalistic freedoms generally and of the principle of not allowing interference in the course of people's economic life. But in case the private ownership is put under limits and the economic activity is subjected to minute supervision aiming at preventing monopoly and a small group ruling the trade markets, the monopolisation would not find its capitalistic trodden way to annihilation and ruination.

* * * * *

CHAPTER TWO

M A R X I S M

MARXIST CREED:

- I - INTRODUCTION**
- II - SOCIALISM**
- III - COMMUNISM**

I- INTRODUCTION

We had said in the beginning of this book that the economic creed means a special way of life whose champions call for organising social existence on its basis, as it is the best plan which materialises abundance and well being in the economic domain for humanity as yearned by it. As for the economic sciences, they are but organised studies in respect of the real laws which govern the society in so far as its economic life is concerned. So the creed is planning of work and a call and knowledge (science) is discovery or an effort to discover reality and a law. That is why, creed is an effective element and a factor for creation and renovation. But knowledge records economic events objectively with-out any action fraudulent or otherwise.

It is on this basis we have made discrimination between historical materialism and the Marxist Creed, in our study of Marxism. Thus the historical materialism with which we dealt in the first part of our discussion means the science of the laws

of production, its growth, development and its social results in different economic, political and ideological fields. In other words, it is the science of the Marxist economy, which gives economic explanation of the entire history in the light of productive powers. The Marxist Creed means the social system to which Marxism calls and for the materialization of which it leads humanity. Thus the position of Marxism with regard to the historical materialism is similar to that of a physicist vis-à-vis physical laws. Marxism occupies the position of announcing good news and invitation, in view of its creed.

In spite of those two different aspects of science and religion, the link between the historical materialism and the doctrinal Marxism is very strong. Because the doctrine towards which Marxism calls is in reality but a legal expression and a legislature form of a certain stage of the historical materialism and a limited part of the general historical curve which is imposed by the movement of the rising production and its laws and its inconsistencies. Thus when Marxism puts in the robes of doctrinal motive it simply expresses, thereby, the historical reality of those laws. It looks at the invitation as being an enforcement of the will of history and materialisation of the demands of the economic factor which is today, leading the human caravan towards a new stage, a stage in which the plans of the Marxist doctrine are embodied.

It was for this reason that Marx used to give his doctrine the name of scientific socialism to distinguish it from other kinds of socialism the champions expressed, therein, their suggestions and personal feelings rather than the historical necessity and the laws thereof. Therefore they formed their doctrines regardless of scientific account, the study of the productive powers and development thereof.

In the Marxist doctrine there are two stages which Marxism demands – from the doctrinal aspect to materialise successively and stresses -from historical materialistic aspect -

MARXIST CREED

their historical need as well. These stages are the socialist and then the Communist one. Thus the Communist one is regarded - from the point of view of historical materialism - as the highest of the stages of the human development because this is the stage in which the history accomplishes its greatest miracle and in which the means of production have their decisive say. As for this the socialist stage which comes into being on the dissolution of the capitalistic society and replaces capitalism directly it expresses, on the one hand, the inevitable historical revolution against capitalism when it shortens and on the other hand it is considered as an essential condition to bring about the Communist society and piloting of the ship to the shore of history.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM?

Each of the two stages - Socialism and Communism - has its own signposts which distinguishes it from the other. The main signposts and pillars of the Socialist stage are briefly as under:

Firstly, obliteration of the classism and settling its account finally by creating a classless society.

Secondly, acceptance of Proletarian as a political equipment by establishing a dictatorial government competent enough to materialize the historical message of the socialist society.

Thirdly, naturalisation of the resources of wealth and the capitalistic means of production in the country in which are the means which their owner exploits through waged work - and regarding these as being the property of all.

And fourthly, arranging the distribution on the principle of "from everyone according to his capacity and for everyone according to his work".

When the human caravan reaches the height of history or the real Communism, most of these signposts and pillars undergo

development and change. Thus Communism returns the first of the pillars of socialism that is the obliteration of the classification, while disposing off the rest of its ingredient and pillars. Thus in respect of the second pillar, Communism finally puts an end to the tale of the government and the politics on the stage of history since it deals a death blow to the government of Proletarianism and liberates the society from the clutches of the government and its restrictions. It also does not stop at nationalising the capitalistic means of production as established by socialism on the third pillar, but it goes further by nullifying private ownership of the individual means of production as well (which are those which the owner exploits himself rather than through hirelings. Similarly it disallows private ownership of consumer goods and its prices. More comprehensively speaking, it completely nullifies private ownership in both the fields, production and consumption. Similarly it brings about a decisive change in the principle on which the distribution is based under the fourth pillar, as it bases the distribution on the principle from everyone according to his capacity and for everyone according to his need.

* * * * *

This is the Marxist doctrine in both of its stages, Socialist and Communist. Obviously, there are three ways to study any doctrine, which are as under:

First, criticism of the theoretical principles and bases on which the doctrine centres.

Second, study of the extent of the applicability of these principles to the doctrine which is therein.

Third, discussion of the essential idea of the doctrine with regards to its applicability and the extent to which idea was objective and had other possibility.

In our study of the Marxist doctrine we are going to adopt

MARXIST CREED

these three ways together.

GENERAL CRITICISM OF THE DOCTRINE

Ever since we started studying doctrinal Marxism, in the light of the forementioned methods, we are facing the most important and serious question, in the field of doctrinal discussion i.e. the question about the basic argument whereupon the doctrine is based and which brings out, in a logical way, the call for it and its adoption and consequently its implementation and basing the life thereupon.

Certainly Marx does not rely, in justifying Socialism and Communism on particular moral values and meanings in equality, as do other Socialists, when he describes as being imaginists be-cause in his opinion moral values and meanings are but the outcome of the economic factor and social position of the powers of production. There is no sense, therefore, in making a call to social situation on a purely moral basis.

Marx only relies on the laws of historical materialism which explains movement of history in the light of the development of productive powers and different forms thereof. Thus he considers these laws the scientific basis of history and the power which brings about its successive stages in determined periodical points, in accordance with the production powers and their social form in vogue.

In this light he finds that socialism is an inevitable result of these laws which do their decisive work towards changing the last stage of the class, that is the capitalistic stage, to a classless social society. As for the question as to how the Marxist laws of historical materialism work to annul capitalism, it is explained by Marx, as we have seen before, in his analytical discussions about the capitalistic economy, wherein he tried to discover the fundamental inconsistencies which lead to capitalism, according

to the laws of historical materialism to its death and take the humanity's caravan to the socialist stage. In short, the laws of historical materialism constitute the general principle for all the stage of history, in the opinion of Marx, and the analytical bases in the Marxist economy -like the law of value and the theory of surplus value — about the effort to apply those principles to the capitalist stage and the doctrinal socialism is the necessary result for this application and doctrinal expression of the inevitable historical course of capitalism as imposed by the general laws of history.

We in our wide discussion about the historical materialism - with its laws and stages arrived at results other than these at which Marxism had arrived. We have seen clearly that historical reality of humanity does not march with the procession of historical materialism nor does its social content get support from the position of the productive powers and their inconsistencies and laws. We also realised through over study of the laws of the Marxist economy, the mistake of Marxism in the analytical bases in the light of which it explained inconsistency of capitalism from various aspects and its continuous march towards its inevitable end. Because all those inconsistencies centred round the Marxist law of value and the theory of surplus value. Consequently with the collapse of these two props the entire edifice would threaten to fall.

Even if we suppose that Marxism was right in its analytical study of the capitalistic economy, those basis only disclose the power and the consistencies which causes slow death to capitalism until it breathes its last. But they do not prove that Marxist socialism was the only substitute for capitalism in the historical course of development. But they open the way for numerous economic forms to occupy the centre of capitalism in the society, be it Marxist socialism, like the state's socialism of any of its colours, or the double economy, any of the forms of

MARXIST CREED

ownership, or redistribution of the wealth among the countrymen in the framework of private ownership and other such forms which tackle crisis of capitalism, without being obliged to revert to the Marxist socialism.

In this way, doctrinal Marxism loses its scientific evidence as also the mark of historical necessity which it derived from the laws of historical materialism and the Marxist principles about history and economy. And after the doctrinal idea took off its scientific garb, it remained at the level of other doctrinal suggestions.

II—SOCIALISM

Let us now study the main elements and sign points of socialism in some detail.

The first element is to obliterate division of the society into classes, which puts an end to different kinds of struggles with which human history is replete. Because the cause of those forms of struggle in the class inconsistency which resulted from division of the society into the owners and the have-nots. Consequently, when socialism came into being and turned the society into one class, there was no longer the class inconsistency, all the forms of struggle disappeared and harmony and peace prevailed for ever.

The idea in this is based on the opinion of historical materialism which says that the economic factor is the only factor in the life of the society. This opinion has led Marxism into saying that the condition of private ownership which has divided the society into owners and the have-nots is the actual basis of the class — composition in the society. But in view of the inconsistency anti the struggle that result from this composition and as long as the socialistic society amounts private ownership and nationalises the means of production, the historical basis of the division of society into classes is blown up and it becomes impossible for the class composition to continue its existence after the disappearance of the economic conditions

MARXIST CREED

whereupon it rests.

We have known, in our study of historical materialism, that the economic factor and the position of private ownership are not the only basis of all the class compositions on the stage of history, as may a class composition existed on military, political or religious bases as we have seen before. Therefore, it is not necessary historically that the division of society into classes should disappear with the end of private ownership but it is possible that a class composition may take place in the socialistic society on some other basis.

While analysing the socialist state, we had found that in view of its economic and political nature it leads to the creation of a new form of class inconsistency after dealing a death blow to the former forms of the division of the society into classes.

As for the economic nature of the socialistic stage, it is represented in the principle of distribution which is based on from every one according to his power and for every one in accordance with his work. We shall soon see, through the study of this principle, how it leads to the creation of difference afresh. Let us therefore, now take up the political nature of socialism for discussion and examination.

The basis condition for the socialistic revolutionary experiment is that it should materialise at the hands of revolutionaries and intellectuals taking its leadership. Because it is not reasonable that the Proletarian with all its elements should take the leadership of the revolution and direction of the experiment. It must carry on its revolutionary activity under the shadow of leadership and direction. That is why Lenin stressed, after the failure of the revolution of (1905) that the professional revolutionaries alone can form a party of Belshevik type . . . Thus we find that the revolutionary leadership of the working class was the natural property of those who call themselves professional revolutionaries in the same way the revolutionary leadership of the farmers and

the workers during the former revolutions was possessed by persons who were not from among the farmers and the workers with one difference between the two conditions and it was this that the distinction of leadership for the persons in the socialist stage does not represent economic influence. It takes place only out of ideological, revolutionary and party peculiarities. This revolutionary and party colour constituted a curtain on the socialist experiment which Eastern Europe had. It concealed the reality from the people so that they ostensibly did not discord in that revolutionary leadership of the socialist experiment, a seed of what Marxism describes as the worst form in history of the division of the society into classes. Because this leadership must have the authority in an absolute form of the socialist stage in the opinion of Marxism which considers it necessary to establish a dictatorship and central absolute authority to finally settle the account of capitalism. Lenin described the nature of the authority under the system of the party which possesses the real authority in the country during the revolution by saying:

It is not possible for a Communist Party, in the present case of an acute civil war, to discharge its duty except when it was organised in an extremely centralised fashion and except when it was controlled by an iron (strong) system similar to the military system and except when its central apparatus was a strong one and dominant enjoying wide authority and full confidence of the members of the party.

Stalin added:

"This is the situation in regard to the system of the party, during the period of the struggle preceding materialisation of dictatorship and the same must be said, even to a greater degree, about the system of the party after dictatorship had materialised." Therefore, the socialist experiment is particularly distinct from the rest of the revolutionary experiments in that it is obliged, in the opinion of its magnates, to continue following the

MARXIST CREED

revolutionary way and the absolute system of Government, within the Party and outside it, with a view to creating new socialist man, free from the ills of the class societies and their exploitive tendencies in which humanity has lived for thousands of years.

Thus it becomes necessary that the revolutionaries, the leaders, and those who circle in their party, orbit, should wield the authority in an unlimited form so that they could work the miracle and manufacture the new man.

When we reach this stage of the sequence of the socialist experiment, we find that these leaders in the party and political framework as well as their supporters, enjoy such possibilities as most of the classes did not have throughout the history and at the same time they do not miss any of the characteristics of the class, since they have gained absolute authority over all the properties and the nationalised means of production as also a political centre enabling them to benefit from these properties and to handle them according to their special interest. Besides, they have come to firmly believe that their absolute authority ensures happiness and abundance for all the people, just as the former groups had believed, which enjoyed rule during the Feudalist and Capitalist periods.

The only difference between these revolutionary rulers and the other classes about which Marxism tells us: these used to come into being and grow — in the opinion of the Marxists — in accordance with the proprietary relations existing among the people and it was the nature of these relations which determined inclusion of this person in this class or that. But as regards these new proprietors in the socialist stage it was not the nature of the ownership which determined their inclusion in the ruling class. Thus, this person or that is not included in the ruling class because he is owner of a particular property in a certain degree in the society, as Marxism supposed in respect of the former class societies, but the case is just the reverse in the Marxist socialist

society. Because this one or that enjoys special privileges or the real content of the ownership as he is included in the ruling class.

The explanation of this difference between the class in the socialist society and other classes is clear, because this class did not take birth on the economic field whereupon other classes were born in the opinion of Marxism. But it came into being and grew on the political field under a system of a certain kind, resting on special philosophical, doctrinal and national bases, that is within the revolutionary party leading the experiment. Therefore the party with its system and special limits, constitutes the factory of this ruling class.

The manifestations of this party class are confined to the unlimited privileges of administration enjoyed by the members of this class, extending from the administration of state and industrial organisations and projects of production to all walks of life which is also reflected in the great inconsistencies existing between the wages of the workers and the salaries of the employees of the party.

It is possible for us to explain, in the light of class circumstances to which the Marxist socialist stage leads, the forms of inconsistency and the struggle in the political field in the socialist world which are sometimes represented in colossal purgative operations. The privileged class under the shadow of the socialist experiment grew within the party as we have seen but on the one side it does not include the entire party and on the other it may extend beyond precincts of the party in accordance with the circumstances besetting the leadership and their demands.

It was therefore but natural that the privileged class should encounter strong opposition within the party from those persons who were not included in that class despite their belonging to the party or who were expelled from its fold and consequently they began to regard this new class composition a betrayal of the principles they proclaimed.

MARXIST CREED

The privileged class also faces great opposition from outside the party whom it could exploit, by dint of the party's political reality, in the form of special privileges, certain rights, monopolisation of the administrative apparatuses and the essential (public utilities) in the country.

It appears logical - after this - that large scale purgative operations - as the Communists call them - a reflection of those circumstances and the class run consistencies. It is also natural that these operations be gigantically violent and comprehensive, according to the power class centre which is enjoyed by the ruling group in the party and the state.

To realise the extent of the violence and comprehensiveness (of the operations) it would suffice us to know that they used to continuously take place at the top of the party's entity in the same way as they did at the bottom, with a violence which exceeds that which Marxism presents as a general mark for different forms of class inconsistencies in history. The purgative operations once comprehended nine of the eleven members of the Ministry, who moved the wheel of the Soviet Government in 1936. These operations also included five of the seven chiefs of the Central Soviet Executive Committee which formulated the Constitution of 1936 and swept off forty three Secretaries of the Central organisation of the Party out of a total of fifty three, as also seventy of the eighty members of the War Committee, three of the five Marshals of the Soviet Army approximately sixty per cent of the total number of Soviet Generals and all the members of the first political office which Lenin had established after the revolution, with the exception of Stalin. Similarly the clearing operations led to the expulsion of more than two million members of the party. These operations also led to what happened in 1939 as the result of which two million members of the official party were expelled of a total number of two million and a half. Thus the number of the expelled members

of the Communist Party was almost equal to the entire Party itself.

By this we do not aim at publishing the ruling apparatus in the Socialist Society – nor does publicity behove this book. All that we aim at is to analyse the Socialist stage scientifically to see how dictatorial materialism, by its very nature, leads to class circumstances which give birth to horrible forms of struggle. And Lo! The very experiment which came to efface class system set it up afresh.

* * * * *

The dictatorial authority which is the second pillar in the Socialist stage is not necessary for settling the account of Capitalism only, as believed by Marxism because it regards it a temporary necessity which lasts until all the spiritual, ideological and social characteristics of Capitalism are wiped out. It only constitutes an expression of a deeper necessity in the nature of the Marxist Socialism which believes in the necessity of economic controlled planning in all the branches of the economic activity in life. Because the situation of such a planning and implementation thereof demands powerful authority which is not subjected to supervision and which enjoys great possibilities so that it could hold with an iron hand all the public utilities in the country and distribute them in accordance with a comprehensive and minutes plan. Thus the central economic planning prescribes the political authority a dictatorial nature to a large extent and not the mission of clearing the atmosphere from a legacy of Capitalism. It alone prescribes this political colour of government.

* * * * *

After this we reach the nationalisation as being the third

MARXIST CREED

pillar of the Socialist stage.

The scientific notion about nationalisation is based on the inconsistencies of the surplus value wherefrom comes about the private ownership of the means of production, in the opinion of Marx, because these inconsistencies go on piling up until the nationalisation of all the means of production unavoidable become historical necessity.

We have already discussed these so-called inconsistencies and seen how they are based on wrong analytical bases. It is but natural that the conclusions be wrong when the bases of the analysis were misleading and wrong.

As for the doctrinal notion about nationalisation, it is summed up in obliterating private ownership and crowning all with the ownership of the means of production in the country so that everyone, being a member of the entire society, becomes owner of all the riches of the country as were the others.

But this notion clashes with a reality that is the political reality of the Socialist stage which is embodied in the class which enjoys absolute dictatorial rule in the apparatuses of the Party and the State.

In such a circumstance it is not sufficient to annul private ownership legally and announcement be made about the wealth being the property of all so that all may really enjoy it and find its real content in their life. But the nature of the political situation would make the lot of all legal only by letting the ruling class enjoy the real content of the ownership which is represented in its absolute domination over the destinies and riches of the country. In this way this class obtains the same opportunities which the monopolist Capitalists used to enjoy in the Capitalist society, because it stands behind every deed of the State and monopolises the right of representing the class —less society and disposing its properties and — in that moment — becomes more powerful than any other Capitalist to steal off the surplus value. What are

then the scientific guarantees in this regard?

Borrowing from Marxism its language we could say: The nationalisation in the Marxist Socialist Society brings forth an inconsistency between the socialist ownership for all (the people) and the real substance of the ownership which the ruling class enjoys. Because the ownership in its real substance is nothing but authority over the wealth and power to enjoy it with different methods. This is the substance which is enjoyed by the political powers which dominate all the entities of the society and is reflected on the legal field in the form of privileges and rights which are in reality a false cover and a legal translation of the real substance of ownership. But this new owner in the Marxist Socialist Society differs from any former owner in one point and it is this that he cannot admit his ownership legally as it contradicts his political stand. Thus Socialism carries — because of its political nature - the seed of this new ownership and creates him across its experiment although at the same time makes it incumbent on him to deny his real role in the economic life and makes him more shameful than the Capitalist who used to declare, with all impudence, about his private ownership.

The nationalisation in Marxist Socialism is not a unique event in history as there have been previous experiments with the idea of nationalisation in history. Many old States had nationalised all the ways of production and thereby earned gains quite similar to those secured by the Marxist Socialism in its experiment. Thus in some Hellenistic countries and especially in Egypt the Governments followed the principle of nationalisation and subjected the production and the exchange to its control taking over the administration of most of the branches of production with the result that this system secured for the Government great benefits. But in cases where it was enforced in the framework of Pharaonic absolute authority, its substance could not remain hidden. Because the nationalisation carried out under the shadow of an absolute authority which

MARXIST CREED

creates collective ownership to expand the production, cannot actually lead but to the authority itself becoming dominate and controlling the nationalised properties and that is why these appeared in the old experiment, treachery – on the part of the employers and despotism on the part of the authority which used to be embodied in the person of the king so that the king jumped up to the status of a god and all the gigantic powers began to spend all their properties on this ruler god to serve his desires, such as the building of temples, palaces and graves.

It was not merely by chance that the experiment of nationalisation in the most ancient Pharaonic time was accompanied with the same phenomena as attend the Marxist experiment of nationalisation in the modern times, such as rapid progress in the production and the authority enjoying power which strengthens and grows in a colossal form and thereafter taking away and having despotic control over the nationalised wealth. Thus the production has increased under the shadow of modern experiment of nationalisation as it did under the shadow of Pharaonic experiment. Because dependent exploitation in production always results in temporary rapid progress on the production movement. In both the experiments nationalisation grew under the shadow of a supreme authority, knowing no bounds because when only increase in production is aimed at by nationalisation, it requires such an iron authority indeed.

In both the experiments this also resulted in the authority becoming terrible and enjoying of the real substance of ownership because nationalisation was not based on a spiritual base or contentment with man's moral values. It was based on a material-ism only to materialise greatest production. It is but natural that the authority should not find consistency between this material objective and the privileges and enjoyment in which it makes itself roll. It is also natural that the ruling apparatus should not confirm the general ownership practically

except within the limits of the material incentive which makes it increase and promote production.

It does appear strange, after this, that we find the State's apparatus in the old experiment, crying about the treachery of the employees and their getting rich at the cost of public properties, while we find Stalin, in the modern experiment, being obliged to admit that high employees in the State and the Party, availing the opportunity of their State being engaged in the recent war, had accumulated money and riches, so much so that he published it in a circular letter to all the countrymen.

Thus the semblance between the two socialist experiments is very clear, both in appearance and results, in spite of the difference in their civil conditions and the forms in the production. This indicates that the substance in both the experiments is one and the same, however different the colours and frameworks might be.

Thus we come to know that every experiment of nationalisation produces the same results if it was done in the same political framework of the Marxist experiments the framework of absolute authority, and the factual justification for it was, in the opinion of the leaders of the experiment, was the same justification on which leaders of Marxism base their experiment, which is growth of production which constitutes the incentive power of history, with the passage of time, in the meanings of historical materialism.

* * * * *

As for the last pillar of the Socialist stage, it is - as described earlier, the principle of distribution which says, "from everyone according to his power and for everyone in accordance with his work."

This principle depends, from scientific point of view, on

MARXIST CREED

the laws of historical materialism. Because after becoming one class in accordance with laws of modern Socialism, the society does not remain comprised of two classes, one that of the workers and the other that of the owners and it becomes necessary for every individual to work so that he may live, just as the Marxist law of value saying that work is the basis of the value, gives to every worker a share in the production commensurate with the amount of the work he puts in and thus the distribution proceeds on the principle, from everyone according to his power and for everyone in accordance with his work.

This principle begins to contradict the classless nature of socialism ever since it is enforced. Because the individuals differ from one another in their work due to the difference in their capabilities, nature of the work and the degree of its complication. Thus, for example, there is a worker who cannot work for six hours whereas the other worker possessing a stronger stamina can work for ten hours every day; and there is a talented worker gifted with genius and intelligence which enable him to introduce improvements in the method of production and therefore he produces more than others do. On the other hand, there is another worker who is not lucky in this regard and is born to follow rather than innovate. Similarly there may be a technical and trained worker capable of producing minute electrical equipments against another worker who is a simple one good only to carry loads. There may be another one working in political field on whose work may depend destiny of the entire country.

The difference in these works leads to the difference in the values created by these works.

These colours (forms) resulting from the difference in the works themselves or the values created thereby are not due to a particular social reality. But Marxism itself admits about it as it divides work into two, simple and compound believing that the value of an hour's compound and greatly complicated work may

be many times more than that of an hour's simple work.

The socialist society, while facing this problem, finds only two alternative ways before it to solve the issue.

One, to adhere to the principle of distribution which says: "for everyone according to his work" and therefore distribute the production among the individuals with different degrees, thereby creating class differences once again and thus the socialist society gives birth to class constitution in a new way.

Two, that the socialist society may borrow from the Capitalist on its method of taking away the surplus value according to the Marx opinion so that the wages of all the individuals be equalised.

The theory and the application (adaptation) take two different direction in the solution of this problem.

Thus the application – or the reality of the socialist society existing today – adopts the first way to solve the problem, which involves the society in class inconsistencies anew and that is why we find that the proposition between the low and the rising in-come in Russia is said to reach 5% and 1.5% according to different estimates. The Socialist leaders have found that it is practically impossible to implement absolute equality and to bring down the work of scholars, politicians and the military men to the level of the simple work because it freezes mental growth and paralyses technical and mental life, making most of the people turning to insignificant works, as long as the wage is the same, irrespective of the disparity and the complication involved therein. It is for this reason that disparities and inconsistencies grew in the socialist experiment, which were afterwards, deepened by the ruling authorities, according to its political nature. Therefore it established the secret Police class which was given great privileges for its spying activities. It established this (Police Force) to support its dictatorial entity. The result was that the society at last found itself faced with the same reality which socialism promised to

MARXIST CREED

help it get rid of.

As for the direction of the theory for the solution of the problem, an indication is found to renew this direction in the book *Anti-Dühring*, when Engels presented the problem and replied thereto by saying :

How could, then, the problem of payment of big wages for the compound work be solved? The entire question is important. In the society of specialist producers, the individuals or their families stand the cost of the training of a competent worker and hence the price paid for competent working power ensues from the individuals themselves. Thus a skilled slave is sold at a high price and one who earns the wages and the skilled (workers) are paid high prices. It is the society itself which bears this cost, in case it is organised according to the socialist system. So it is the society which enjoys the fruit, that is the high value produced by the compound work, increased wage being in demand of the worker.

This theoretic solution of the problem which Engels puts forward, supposes that the high values, which distinguish compound work from simple work, counterbalance the expenses of the training of the competent work in the compound work. In view of the fact that in a capitalist society an individual bears the expenses of his training himself, he is entitled to those values which result from his training. But in a socialist society state itself bears the expenses incurred on his training and therefore it is entitled to the high values of the compound work, exclusively and in that case the technical work has no right to demand a wage more than that of a simple worker.

But this assumption is inconsistent with the actual fact as the high values which a political and military worker obtains in

1. *Anti-Dühring*, (Arabic transl.), vol.* p.96

a society of specialist producers in the capitalist society very much exceed the expenses incurred on his studies in political and military sciences as explained earlier.

Besides this, Engels has not put forward his solution of the problem in an exact form which may be consonant with the so-called scientific bases in the Marxist economy. Engels forgot that the value of the commodity produced by a trained technical worker which he creates does not include cost of his training and the expenses incurred on his studies. What determines its value is only the amount of work practically involved in the production thereof in addition to the amount of work spent by the worker during studies and the training. Thus it is possible that the worker may spend the years of work in training costing him one thousand Dīnars. The cost of this training, that is one thousand Dīnar, would represent the amount of work stored therein, which is less than the work of ten years. Thus the cost of training, in this example, becomes less than the value in the creation of which the work of the worker alone during his training contributed like the cost of renewal of the power of work which is less than the value which is created by the work itself, as believed and the surplus value theory.

Therefore, what would Engels do when the amount of work represented in the expenses incurred on the training of the work, becomes less than the amount of work spent by the worker during the training. The state in such a case has no right –on the basis of Marxist economy – to pluck fruit of the training and snatch from the worker the value which he had created in the commodity with his work during the training, for the reason that it had paid up the cost of training. Because the additional value enjoyed (possessed) by the production of the technical worker does not represent the expenses of his training and cost of his studies but it represents the work completed by the worker during the studies. So if this work was more than the amount of work represented in

MARXIST CREED

the expenses of training, the worker was entitled to increase wage for his technical production.

Engels missed (ignored) another thing also and that is this that complication of work does not always spring from training but it sometimes comes about because of natural talents found in the worker enabling him to produce in an hour of work what could not be produced collectively except in two hours. Thus he creates in one hour a value which others do in two hours, on account of his natural competence and not because of any previous studies. So should this worker get double that which others do — in which case the socialist society would be creating differences and inconsistencies — or he be equalised with others, being not given except half of the value created by him, whereby the socialist society would be committing theft of the surplus value?!

To sum up, the Government in the Marxist Socialist stage has only two alternatives before it: either to implement the theory as imposed by the Marxist law of value and therefore distribute to everyone according to his work and thereby create the seed of class inconsistency anew, or it should elevate from the theory in so far as the implementation was concerned and equalise the simple work with the compound one and an ordinary worker with a talented one and thereby take away from the talented worker the surplus value whereby he is superior to an ordinary one, quite as the capitalist used to do to the credit of the historical materialism.

III— COMMUNISM

Having completed the study of the socialist stage we reach the final stage in which communist society takes birth and humanity is resurrected to the earthly Paradise promised by the historical materialism's prophethood.

Communism has two main pillars:

First: Wiping out of private ownership not only in the field of capitalistic production but in the field of production generally, and also in the field of consumption. Thus it nationalises all the means of production and all the consumer goods.

Second: Elimination of political authority, and finally liberation of the society from the Government.

As for the wiping out of private ownership in all the fields, it does not derive its existence in the doctrine from the scientific law of value, as the nationalisation of the means of capitalist production were based on the theory of surplus value and the Marxist law of value. The idea in generalising nationalisation is based on the assumption that the society attains a high degree of richness thanks to the Socialist System as the production powers also grow enormously and therefore no room is left for private ownership of the consumer goods, not to speak of the ownership of the means of production because every individual in the Socialist Society would get what he needed and longed to

MARXIST CREED

consume it any time he liked. Therefore, what was the need for private ownership? !

On this basis the principle of distribution in the socialist society is based on the maxim of "Everyone is given according to his need and not according to his work", that is, everyone is given only as much as satisfied his want and met all his demands because the wealth possessed by the society could satisfy all the wants ...

We know no hypothesis more imaginative and wider than this that every man in the socialist society is able to satisfy all his desires and needs entirely and completely in the same way as he fulfils his needs of water and air, so that there may be no scarcity nor crowding over the commodities nor any need to have any thing exclusively.

It appears from this just as Communism works wonders in human personality, turning the people into (Amaleqas) in production despite disappearance of personal impulses and ego under the shadow of nationalisation, it also works wonder with nature itself by stripping it of covetousness and parsimony and bestowing it with gracious spirit which always gives in generosity all that is demanded by the colossal production such as resources, mines and rivers.

Unfortunately, the leaders of the Marxist experiment tried to create the promised Paradise on earth but they failed in doing so with the result that the experiment remained preponderating between Socialism and Communism till it expressed publicly its inability to materialise communism in the same way as does every experiment which tries to adopt an imaginary direction inconsistent with human nature. Thus the socialist revolution took, in the beginning, a purely socialist direction when Lenin endeavoured that everything be common (circulating) among all. Therefore, he wrenched land from its owners and stripped the farmers of their individual means of production which led the

farmers to revolt and call a strike and stop production. Consequently the famine took place which shook the very existence of the country and obliged the authorities to refrain from their plan so that they restored proprietary rights to the farmers and the country regained its natural condition till came the year (28-30) when another revolution took place aimed at taking away the ownership anew. Consequently, the farmers resumed their revolution and strike whereupon the government carried out a large-scale killing and banishment of the people and the prisons were filled with the arrested people to the capacity, the number of those killed reaching – it is said – one hundred thousand, according to the Communist reports and many times the number, according to the reports of the enemies. The famine resulting from the strike and disturbance in 1932 took a toll of six million people according to the confession of the government itself. Therefore, the authority was obliged to withdraw and it decided to grant the farmer some land, a hut and some cattle to benefit therefrom, on the condition that the real ownership belonged to the state and the farmer joined the society of (Communist Agricultural Kolkhoz) which is looked after by the state which can expel any member therefrom whenever it liked.

* * * * *

As for the second pillar of Communism (disappearance of government) it is the most curious thing in Communism. The idea in the matter is based on the opinion of historical materialism about the description of the government as being an offspring the class inconsistency as it is an organisation which is created by the owners class to make the working class subservient to it. In the light of this description, therefore, there remains no justification for the government in a classless society, after it had got rid of all the vestiges and remains of being divided into classes and it becomes but natural that the

MARXIST CREED

government should vanish consequent upon disappearance of its historical basis.

We have a right to put a question about this change which turns the history from society of state into one free from it, from the socialist stage to the communist one: as to how this social change takes place?! And whether it occurs through a revolutionary way?! So that the society changes from being socialist to the communist in a decisive moment as it changed from capitalist to socialist? ! Or the change takes place in a gradual way so that the state withers and shrinks until it vanishes? !

So if the change was revolutionary and simultaneously and proletarianism was annihilated by way of revolution, then which revolutionary class was it at whose hands this change would be completed?! We have been told by Marxism that a social revolution against a government always sprouts from the class which is not represented by that government. In the light of this, therefore, a revolutionary change towards communism must be materialised at the hands of the class not represented by the socialist government that is the proletarian class. So does Marxism wants to tell us that the communist revolution takes place at the hands of capitalists, for example?!

If the change from socialism and the disappearance of government was gradual, then it contradicted — before anything else — the norms of dialectics on which Marxism is based. Because the law of quantity and quality in Dialectics stresses that qualitative changes are not gradual but they take place in a sudden way, jumping from one state to another. On the basis of this law, Marxism believed in the necessity of revolution in the beginning of every historical stage being a simultaneous change. Then how did this law become null and void at the time of the society's change from socialism to communism?

The peaceful gradual change from the socialist stage to the communist one is inconsistent with the laws of dialectic as it

contradicts the nature of things also. Because how could we imagine that a government in the socialist society gradually relinquishes the authority and shrinks itself until it deals a death blow to itself, while every other government on the face of earth adheres to its centre and defends its political existence till the last moment of its life? ! So can there be anything more strange than this gradual shrinking which the government itself offers to materialise and thereby bestows its own life for the sake of the society's development! But is there something that is more distant than this from the nature of the socialist stage and the real experiment embodied in the world today?! Since we have learnt that one of the things essential for the socialist stage is the establishment of a dictatorial government with absolute power. How does this absolute dictatorship, then, become a prelude for the disappearance and destruction of the government finally?! And how could the fact of the authority becoming serious and arbitrary pave the way for its disappearance and concealment?!!

Lastly, let us lean towards Marxism in its notions and suppose that the miracle has materialised and that the communist society has come into being with everyone working according to his power and getting according to his needs. Does then the society not need an authority that may determine this need and conciliate between the conflicting needs in case they centred round one commodity and which may also regulate work and divide it among various branches of production.

* * * * *